

1044  
A REPLY TO A  
notorious Libell

*Intituled*

A BRIEFE APOLOGIE  
or defence of the Ecclesiastical  
*Hierarchie, &c.*

Wherein sufficient matter is discovered  
to giue all men satisfaction, who lend both  
their eares to the question in controuersie be-  
tweene the Iesuits and their adherents  
on the one part, and the Sæcular  
Priests defamed by them on  
the other part.



¶ *Whereunto is also adioyned an  
answere to the Appendix.*

PSAL. 26. *Mentita est iniquitas sibi.*



¶ Imprinted Anno 1603.





# THE PREFACE

to the Reader.

Cap. 36.



*Bi non est sepes (sayth Ecclesiasticus) diripietur possessio. In such times wee doe lue ( courteous Reader) as no care can be too much, no diligence too great, to preserue that litle, which we haue, or are, from ruine, and rapine of the euill disposed mighty. How intolerable the iniuries were, which some Priests once sustained, and afterward freely forgaue, the whole world is now a witnes, and cannot but see, how vntimely these stirres were reuiued by the Iesuits, and the Archpr. after that peace was concluded betweene them. Other iudges, then the whole world, the Priests would haue had, as appeareth by a letter of theirs to the Archpr. in their booke dedicated to the Inquisition pa. 61. but their humble petition was sayd to be a tumultuous presumption, and would not be heard. They foreshewed what danger would grow by his denial of a home-conference: but that did nothing mooue him. They declared that they stood in such tearmes for their good name, and fame, as they must either lue in perpetuall infamie, or vse their pennes in their owne defence: the first no way fitting their calling, and present state: the second very dangerous to both parts: it being very probable, that an Apologie would draw en an Answer: the Answer, a Reply: and that Reply not likely to be the last, howsoeuer lost labour. But neither could this perswasion purchase any peace, or procure, that the Controuersie might be determined at home among themselues. One way more did the Priests assay to stay the outrage of the Iesuits and Archpr. and that was to send to the Vniuersitie of Paris, for their opinion in the matters in question, which was no sooner seene by the Archpr. and Iesuits, but an Edict made, and diuulged in condemnation of their censure and great penalties threatned against those, who should*

29 Maij  
1600.



should either directly or indirectly maintaine, or defend it in word, or in writing, whether it were truly giuen, or forged (*marke I pray you this spirit*) whether vpon true information, or otherwise, as being preiudiciall to the Sea Apostolike, &c.

This headdie proceeding, and disclaiming, or rather condemning all triall (but a selfe will, and a dangerous obstinacie in the Archpr. and Iesuits) compelled the Priests to aduise vpon some other course: in which consult, they resolved to appeale to the Sea Apostolike: and the better to preuent such blockes, as were before layed in their way vpon the like attempt, they published certaine bookes: some in English to satisfie such of our owne Countrey, as were misinformed by the one part, and were not suffered to haue any speech with the other: some in Latine, that the cause comming to triall, might not bee heard with that preiudice, which false informations had before wrought, and would not now be wanting.

Against two of these bookes there is an Apologie lately come forth, to wit, against the Latine booke which is dedicated to his Holinesse, and intituled: *Declaratio motuum* &c. and againe an English booke intituled, *The Copies of certaine discourses*. And at the end of this Apologie there is an Appendix, wherein two other bookes are shrewdly threatned: the one in English, which was written in reply to a letter of the Archpriest, to his assistants, concerning the other bookes, and is intituled, *The hope of peace*: the other in Latine, which was dedicated to the Inquisition: and hath this title, *Relatio compendiosa*, &c. It is a world to see what shifting there is in this Apologie, when a difficultie occurreth to bee answered: what iugling, to haue the matter on the Priestes side seeme odious: what haste a second vntueth maketh to ouertake a former, which through the Authors fault onely had gotten the start: how many rotten points there are, by which one storie is made to hang vnder another: what singular deuotion, and extraordinary charity is expressed in the most vile, and bitter termes, that either malice, or maanesse could deuise: as, <sup>a</sup>Children of iniquitie, <sup>b</sup>Libertines, &c. and how true that sentence is in this Author: *In oculis suis lachrymatur inimicus, & si inuenerit tempus non satiabitur sanguine*: The enemy hath water in his eies: but if the time serue him, it is not blood wil satiate him. And this other also: *Caput suū mouebit, & plaudet manu*, &c. He will shake his head, and clap his hands:

<sup>a</sup> The Epist. to his Hol.  
<sup>b</sup> Apol. cap. 1. fol. 5.

Eccles. cap. 12.



He will seeme to lament the course which is taken, and in the midst of his sorrow he sheweth by one, or other impertinent ridiculous matter, how glad he is of any litle occasion to sport himselfe at the griefes of other men. Yet notwithstanding this so grosse kind of dealing, as any man, who is not ouer-partiall, might enter into it, the applause of the ignorant (who will not either reade the bookes which the Priests set out, or examine what is boldly, although most vntruely, aduouched in this Apologie) demandeth an answer, which although M. Doctor Ely, and M. Iohn Collington haue largely and learnedly giuen to the most principall points therein handled: yet vpon the earnest desire of some, who haue seene this reply in my hands, I emboldened my selfe without the Authours priuitie to publish it, referring the Reader, for more satisfaction in this present controuersie, vnto their labours.

The last yeeres BREVE of the 17. of August would haue cast some doubt into me, whether I might haue attempted thus much, had not the Archpr. after a quarters meditation, or more thereon, published the Apologie, and immediatly after an Appendix vnto it. And if an vncontrolled custome may haue the credite to be the best interpreter of a Lawe, my feare is much lessened by the breaking out of another payre of bookes from the same Authours since that time: In which while they endeuour to manifest the bad spirits of other men, they discover their owne, by such tearmes, as ill be seeme their profession, and pay doubly some one mans debt, to which they would falsely, and against their owne knowledge perswade the Reader, that all the other Priestes were liable: and if no benefite rise by this present discourse to the Reader, yet will it be another (although a needlesse) witnessse against the wilfull blinde, whome the holy Ghost rebuketh by the Psalmist in these wordes: Noli intelligere vt bene ageret: He would not vnderstand that thereby he might doe as hee ought to doe.

*Yours all that he is,*

A. P.





5  
A Reply to a certaine Libell,  
lately published in Print in the name of the  
vnited Priests, called *A briefe Apologie*, sup-  
posed to be made by *F. Parsons*.

CHAP. I.

*How the Authour of the Apologie playeth at All hid, with  
the Reader, and while hee is couered vnder the name of  
vnited Priestes, he discovereth himselfe to be a Iesuit.*



T might sceme a very friuolous labour, to  
examine the title of this *Apologie*, if the  
Author thereof had not bene more curi-  
ous in the like, then there was iust cause,  
and ouer carelesse also what entrance hee  
made to this present woorke of his vn-  
trueths, and poore shifts, when imperti-  
nent discourses doe suffer him to fall into  
the matter in question, which as at other times, so here in the  
very title he peruerteth, and possesseth his Reader, that *an Eccle-  
siasticall Hierarchie erected by his Holines, was impugned by the books  
against which he writeth*, and for his pleasure termeth (although  
most ignorantly) *Libels*: their Authors being alwayes ready to  
iustifie them both before God and the world. And if his Reader  
might be so much fauoured by him, as that hee might haue his  
leauē to peruse those bookes, hee would soone perceiue, how  
falsly this title is set to this *Apologie*: the bookes intreating one-  
ly of the abuses of the authoritie, and of the iust causes of the  
Priests their forbearance, to subiect themselves to a superior of  
the *Card. Caietans* appointing, before any letters came from the



Sea Apostolike, either in confirmation therof: or to shew that the Cardinal had any such authority, or commandement from his Holines, to erect any such *Hierarchy*. This *Apologie* is said to be written, and set foorth for the true information and stay of all good Catholicks, by Priests united in due subordination to the right reuerend Archpriest, and other their superiors. As though those, who had appealed from the Archpriest vpon iust cause, did not remaine in due subordination to him, and other their superiors to whom they had appealed. But to let this calumny passe: there hath bene inquiry made of many, who are the men here meant by these words: *Priests united, &c.* and as yet we cannot heare of any, who were priuie to the writing of it, or setting it forth. Some there are, who confesse, that their consents were asked to the setting foorth of some booke in their names, the contents whereof they were not to know at that time: and of most likelyhood it was to the setting out of this book: but they denied to giue their consents thereunto. Many suspect that this *Apologie* was not written by those Priests, which are here made to father it: but rather by those, who haue alwayes made their commoditie by the disunion of the Priests. And although it go forth in the name of many: it is very probable, that it was made by some one man. For whereas one man setting out a booke may vse his phrase in the plurall number, when he speaketh of himselfe: *wee suppose*: or, *we say*: it is seldome in vse, that many ioyned together, do vse in the like the singuler number: as *I pray you: I suppose*: which here we reade in the Preface *I shall*, in the first chapter: *I thinke, I say*, in the third Chapter: and in the sixt chapter *I omit*. But to let this also passe: there are no weake coniectures, that this *Apology* was made by some Iesuite, who bewrayed himselfe, before he was aware, as may be seene in the 8. chapter of the *Apologie* Fol. 180. where the author hath these words: *Whereabout they aske this question concerning vs, why should they be unwilling to procure, &c.* And if any man will take the paines to turne to that place cited by these Authors, hee shall finde, that the question was asked concerning no other then Iesuits, and consequently, that out of this place of the *Apologie*, there is iust cause to take them for the Authors. Another coniecture there is, that *Fa Parsons* in particuler is the author

The Author of  
the Apol. bewray-  
eth himselfe to  
be a Iesuite.

Copy of Dis-  
course, Pa. 5.

F Parsons the  
Author.



thor of this *Apologie*: because in the common opinion of many, who haue read his stile, this is so like vnto it, as it would be hard for any man to imitate it so neerely, without the very same gift which he hath. And the number of letters, and such as they are, do almost conuince, that it is his doing. For what occasion had any Priests here in *England* to enter into so many impertinent matters to their state and profession, as are here by manuscripts testified, which probably were not to be gotten, by the first of *Iuly* after the publication of the bookes, he vndertaketh to answer. And *F. Garnet* the head of the Iesuits did almost discover as much in a letter of his of the last of *Iuly* Anno 1601. to a *Sæcular Priest*: wherein he told him, that the two printed books (against which this *Apologie* is written) should be (God willing) answered from *Rome*. Such as had read: *Laudet te alienus, & non os tuum*, Let an other man and not thine owne mouth praise thee, might doubt whether *F. Parsons* would so grossely commend himselfe, as here he is commended, were he not known to be one, who would not willingly, that any mouth or pen, of which he hath the gouernment, should not shewe foorth his praises. Some other might doubt whether it were his doing, because of the diuerse Englishing of this sentence: *Obedite prepositis vestris, & subiaccite eis*: which here is thus Englished: *Obey your Superiours and submit your selues vnto them*. And in his selfe-clawing *Wardword* (wherein hee discovereth a piece of his disposition against some *Catholiques*) he translateth it thus: obey your Prelates and lie vnder them. Perchance those who had the printing of this *Apologie*, prefixed this sentence: and we will imagine, that they, in recompence of his extraordinarie commendations of them, requited him in that, which he might blush to say of himselfe: if at any time his vnderferued prayes may make him blush. There is an other place of scripture taken out of the first to the *Thess. cap. 5. Rogamus vos fratres, corripite inquietos*. We beseech you brethren, repress those that are vniquiet amongst you, which is apparantly abused in this place, both by false translation, and by being applyed against *Cathol. Priests*: because when they saw a thiefe, they did not runne with him, but stood, and stand still, as they are bound in conscience in the defence of their fame against those, who most iniuriously

M.F.B.

Prou. 27.

Hebr. 13.



iniuriously had taken it away in some places, and indeuoured to doe the like seruice elsewhere if they could. It is set out *permissu Superiorum*: that is, by permission of the Superiors: but as yet we cannot learne, what superiors these are, hauing most humbly requested the Archpriest to giue vs satisfaction herein, as may appeare by a letter to him from M. Collington, not long after we had a sight thereof.

It is very probable, that no superiours dare auouch it: for it containeth the most grosse vntrueths, & idlest shifts, and those so hudling one vpon another (especially where the controuersie in question is handled) that it is a very hard matter to find a trueth in it. And doubtlesse this *permissu superiorum* was not set here to any other end, then that the Reader might see, howe the Author could lye by authoritie: which that it may appeare more euident, I haue drawn out of the Apologie some of such falshoods as are conuined to be such in the Apologie it selfe, or otherwise publikely knowen to be such: without medling with those, which otherwise are to be proued as occasion shall serue. I haue also noted a fewe so apparant shifts, as no man of any iudgement can chuse but finde them, and be thoroughly satisfied how this game doth goe.

## CHAP. 2.

*A note of some notorious falshoods and shifts which are contained in the Apologie.*

**I**N the title of this *Apologie*, it is said to be written and set forth by the Priests vnited in due subordination to the R.R. Archpriest: which is prooued to bee false, *Cap. 8. Apol. fol. 108.* where it is confessed, that these Authours are those, concerning whom this question was asked in the English booke entituled, *The Copies of discourses*, pag. 5. *why should they be so unwilling to procure or suffer to bee procured, &c.* which question euery man, who can vnderstand English, may see, that it was asked concerning not the secular Priests, but the Iesuits: and consequently the Iesuites are to be taken for the authours of this *Apologie*, and not the vnited Priests, as here is sayd.

In



In the title of the Table of certaine principall deceits, &c. he telleth his Reader, that it is a *Table of principall deceits, &c. contained in two Libels*: which is prooued to be false both by the eye, and by this which he sayth himselfe in the latter end of the Table. *As for the second booke set out and intituled, The copies of discourses, &c. wee meane not to cite any thing thereof in this place, &c.*

In the Table number 5. he affirmeth, *That the Priests did exercise Card. Allen when he liued, as now they doe other good men, he being opposite vnto them and their factious proceeding, especially against the fathers of the societie.* And this also is a notorious falsehood: the Cardinal beeing neuer opposite against the Priests or any their proceedings, how opposite soeuer he might be against some other kinde of proceedings of some beyond the seas: neither was there any faction in England, against which he might oppose himselfe, as may appeare by the testimony of M. George Blackwell in his letters to Card. Caietane in the yeere 1596. which was long after Card. Allen his death. And the letter which is here cited in confirmation of Card. Allen his being opposite to the Priests, doth shew no more opposition against the Priests then against the Iesuites, as may be seene where it is *Cap. 2. Apol. fol. 11.*

The Apologie contradicted by M. Blackwells letter.

Ibid. num. 6. it is said, that *when the Iesuits were first sent into England* (which was in the yeere 1580. as appeareth *Apol. fol. 181.*) *the Priests had but one only Seminary*, which is proued false *Cap. 1. Apol. fol. 3.* where it is saide that the latter beganne in the yeere 1578.

Ibid. num. 13. It is said that *the good and quiet Cath. prisoners in Wisbich, are compared by the Priests to Donatists, for that they retired themselves from the tumultuous & scandalous life of the other, and put themselves vnder rule*: which is apparantly false, as may be seene in the place quoted, where the Priests doe not onely not accuse any of Donatisme, but shew how F. Weston (of whom the speech is principally in that place) by yeelding to stand to arbitrement, declared himself not to be Tyronius that Donatist.

A very malicious imposture.

Ibid. numb. 14. It is fathered vpon the Priestes, that they should say that *one in Wisbitch Castle fell out of his wits, by reason of opprobrious letters written vnto him*: which is very false, as may



be seene in the place quoted by this Author. The Priests there doe affirme, that one in *Wisbich* fell out of his wits *upon grieſe* (which these Authors leaue out) *taken of certaine letters written*, which were written by himſelfe, and as he confessed ſome-time, that his writing of them was ſuch a corroſiue vnto him, as he ſhould neuer recouer it: and these words *vnto him* are added by these fellowes for their purpose, and for a braue florish, that they might the boldier charge the Priests with a falſhood.

7 Ibid. num. 16. Hee ſhifteth off the aſſertion of the Priests, that *M. Standiſh* had giuen his name to be a Ieſuite (which was a thing to be conſidered of) he being the man, who was ſaid to haue ſolicited this ſubordination in the name of the Secular Priests: and it is ſo alſo confessed in this *Apol. Cap. 8. fol. 98.* The ſhifting of it is in this manner: *All are Ieſuits with theſe men, who are not of their faction, the Archpriest and all.* And thus hee runneth away with the matter: which as is ſaide, ought to be thought vpon as much, as any thing here handled, for the diſcouerie how, and by whome this ſubordination was wrought.

8 Ibid. num. 23. The Priests are charged to call the authority of their ſuperiour inſtituted by Chriſts vicar, *a masking vizard*, which is prooued falſe in the ſame place, where the Priests words are cited. For there (as any man may ſee) they doe only affirme, that the Ieſuits thought to procure dominion to them ſelues *under the maſke of another mans perſon*, which is no impeachment to authoritie, or immodestie againſt it: euery man knowing, that ſuch authoritie as they doe acknowledge moſt iuſt, may be abuſed, and the man who hath it, and made no better then *a masking vizard* vnder which men goe, and doe many things vnſeene and vnknowne.

9 In the liſt of principall perſons that are iniured, num. 11. it is ſaid, that *the moſt Reuerend Father in God the Biſhop of Tricarica Nuntius to his Holines in Flaunders appointed viceprotector, and iudge of English Eccleſiaſticall affairs, is reſuſed by the Priests*: which is moſt falſe, as their going vnto him (long before this booke was ſet out) will make euident, and his letters doe teſtifie as much: and of their acknowledging of him in all dutifull ſort.

10 In the Epiſtle to his Holines, num. 14. it is ſaid, that *the Priests had obtained libertie for foure vnder the Queenes letters patents to ride*



*ride up and downe, &c.* which will appeare evidently to bee an egregious falshood, if the records be sought, vpon which all such letters are to be kept at the L. Keepers perill.

In this place also is another notable falshood, that *fewe Catholikes dared to deny them money, lest they should detect them to the Counsell.* II  
A whetstone.

In the first Chapter of the *Apol. fol. 2.* this author affirmeth, that *the principall or onely ground of this our present contention and scandalous controuersie, is an emulation partly of lay men against Priests, and partly of Priests against religious men, especially the Fathers of the societie.* And in the *11. Chap. fol. 161.* he sayth, that *the whole world knoweth that this cōtrouersie is of Priests with the Archpriest: and that the stomacke against the Iesuits is for standing with the Archpriest.* By which, besides the contradiction, it appeareth how this poore mans memory doth faile him, euen in the deciding betweene whome the controuersie is, which hee vndertaketh to handle and determine. 12  
The Iesuits play at in and out as they list.

In the same Chapter, fol. 6. and 7. the beginning of the association of secular Priests is attributed to the Priests vpon their comming into England, after they were *frustrated of their designments by F. Parsons dealing at Rome:* whereas his comming to Rome was in the yeere 1597. and not before, as appeareth in this place: and the association began in the yeere 1595. and *F. Parsons* was told thereof before hee came out of Spaine for Rome. 13  
A malicious deuise for to discredit the association intended by the priests.

*Cap 3. fol. 20.* The bookes which are set out by the Priests are sayd to be done by such, as went ouer *Seruingmen, Souldiers and wanderers:* which is most apparantly false, if those were the authors which in the beginning of this Apologie are held to be. 14  
The Iesuites care for pure stuffe to make priests of.

*Fol. 21.* It is sayd, *That the whole bodie, and name of Iesuites is impugned:* which is most false, as may appeare in the booke to the *Inquisition, pag. 5.* 15

*Cap. 6. fol. 27.* *D. Norden is saide to haue bene stricken by God with a strange accident of repressing his tongue by dumbnesse, vntill hee died:* which is most false, hee dying no more strangely then all persons vse to die, according to the maner as the sicknesse doth take them. It is well knowen, that he died of a Le-  
thargie, and that he spake manytimes after he was first taken 16  
therewith,



therewith, and died in all points as became a Catholike priest, as there are many to witnesse, who were present.

17

*Cap. 8. fol. 98.* His Holines is sayd to haue resolued to yeeld to the erecting of a gouernment in *England*, vpon a mature deliberation taken of certaine letters, which by the date there set downe were written in England, after that this gouernment was erected. Conferre them with the date of the Card: *Caie- tanes* letters of the institution of the Archpriest, *Martij 7. 1598.* and the first of these here cited, wil be seene to haue bene writ- ten in England about a moneth before.

18

*Fol. 109.* The falsehood which is layd to M. *Blackewel* in his proposing false instructions, and affirming them to haue been annexed to his Commission, is shuffled ouer with an assertion, that his instructions came with his letters, which no man euer doubted of: The exception was against those, which were pro- posed for such, and were not such.

19

In the same leafe M. *Blackewell* his persisting in this error, that we could not appeale from him to his Holines, is shifted: first in this maner: *We are sure he did not say it, in the sense they take it.* Secondly thus: *Manymen in the world might say this in diuers cases, wherin Appeale is cut off by his Holinesse consent and order.* A couple of good ieafts. The first is common to that sort of people, to flie to secret senses, to iustifie any thing, whatsoe- uer passeth them. And it were not altogether so intolerable, if they would (vnder the pretence, that sometime men may æquiocate, by the example of our Sauour, & other his saints) onely vse it to saue themselues from being taken, for such, as they are: but they will pleasure their friends with the like, and be as ready to giue a sense of other mens words, as their owne: but with this difference, that if they can possibly deuise, how to draw other mens words to an euill sense, they will perempto- rily affirme, that those men spake their wordes in that sense. And this their frowardnes towards others is sufficiently dis- couered, *cap 2. Apol fol. 16.* where the priests assertions, *that au- thority is not an infallible rule of trueth: and that but one vpon earth is warranted from error, and not he in all things,* are called in que- stion by this author vpon some his imaginary senses. But in the late spritish *manifestation of spirits*, *cap. 1.* hee discovereth himselfe



himselfe egregiously in this kinde: where confessing that Statutes haue bene made, both by our ancient kings of England, and by our protestant princes, by which they haue forbidden prouisions from Rome of dignities, & Benefices, he telleth his Reader very peremptorily, that they (priests) do conspire and iumpe with the protestant: and in a false, and hereticall sense, obiekt the statute of *Pramunire*. Which also he would seeme to proue, by giuing a reason, why the olde statutes were made: as though neither the statute were to bee interpreted, according to the contents thereof (whatsoever was the cause of the making thereof) nor the absolute prouision of dignities from Rome forbidden: because the motiue of that statute was, to keepe the treasure of England within the land; which was raised by the benefices, at that time annexed to the dignities. But to make this his cauill more plaine: the dignity of a legate had no spirituall liuing annexed vnto it: and yet did those Catholike princes hold him, to haue incurred the penaltie of the Statute of *Pramunire*, who would exercise a power Legantine in England without the Soueraignes consent: as may appeare by the answere of Card. *Wolsey*, when they endighted him in a *Pramunire* vpon those statutes, constrained thereunto (sayth the history) to intitle the King to his goods and possessions.

*My Lords iudges, the Kings highnesse knoweth, whether I haue offended his Maiestie or no, in vsing of my prerogatiue Legantine, for the which I am indited. I haue the Kings license in my coffers vnder his hand and broad Scale, for the exercising and vsing thereof in the most largest wise: the which are now in the handes of my enemies. Therefore because I will not stand in question with the King in his owne cause, I will here presently confesse before you the inditement, and put me wholly to the mercy and grace of the King, trusting that he hath a conscience, and a discretion to consider the truth, and my humble submission and obedience, wherein I might right well stand to the tryall thereof by iustice, &c.* By which it appeareth, that although his Maiesty, who then was, were moued by some of his counsell, infected with *Luthers* doctrine, to condemne the Cardinal, for vsing his power Legantine: yet it is euident by this, that when the King was most Catholike, and the Cardinal also, the Cardinall would not exercise his authoritie Legantine, with-

John Stow, 2r.  
Hen. 8.



out the Kings license, and the King gaue it to him vnder his hand and broad Seale : which conuinceth, that whatsoever was the motiue of making those statutes, all prouisions of dignities from Rome were forbidden, and not those onely which had temporall liuings annexed vnto them. And hereby also may it be seene, how ready these fellowes are to interpret other mens words in the worst sense, which they may, & affirme most peremptorily, that the speakers or writers had those senses, which it most pleased their aduersaries to giue them. And thus much for this point. Onely this is to bee added, that although this new *manifestor of spirits* hath in this place recanted somewhat of his rashnesse, vttered in the *Apol. cap. 2. fol. 15.* concerning the chiefe purpose of those statutes of *Premunire*, yet he hath left somewhat in this *manifestation of spirits*, which he must in some other place recant, or shew himselfe a very obstinate impostor : that is, concerning the time of the enacting those Statutes, which were long before the time, in which hee here sayth they were made, as may appeare by the booke of Statutes.

The second shift is as apparant, as this. For although many men in the world may say as much as the Archpriest said in *diuers cases, wherein Appeale is cut off by his Holinesse consent and order*: yet no man in the world, who professeth to be a Catholike, will say it, and stand peremptorily in it, without some warrant by this clause in their Commission, *appellatione remota*, or to that effect : which is not to be found in the Commission which M. Blackwell had, as may appeare to those, who will reade ouer the Cardinall Caietane his letters : by which he made him an *Archpr. and Superiour* ouer the Seminary priests residing in *England and Scotland*.

20 *Cap. 9. fol. 123.* There are letters of the 18. of *March 1598.* from *Flanders*, brought out against the two Priests, that went from *England* to *Rome*, about an authoritie not then known in *England* : as by the date of the letters of institution, it may be euidently gathered, which was at *Rome 7. Martij 1598.*

21 *Fol. 125. 126. 127.* There are letters brought out to proue, that his Holinesse was prouoked by them to imprison the two priests: whereas the date of the first of them is, after the date of

*F. Bellar-*



*F. Bellarmine* (now Cardinall) his letter to *F. Parsons*, wherein he signified, that his Holines had that resolution, if they came to *Ferrara*; for his letter beareth date the 17. of *October 1598.* as appeareth fol. 120. *Apol.* and the first of the other letters are from *Doway 25. October. 1598.* as appeareth fol. 125.

*Fol. 132.* It is said that *M. Charnocke* said, and swore before, that their onely comming was to supplicate, &c. whereas there is no such matter said, or sworne by *M. Charnocke*, as may appeare fol. 129. where his oath is put downe without this word *onely*, which is here thrust in by the author for his purpose.

22

A most audacious imposture.

*Fol. 128.* The whole English Colledge is said to haue knowen, what passed at *Rome* in this matter, when the two priests were there deteyned prisoners, which (no one being present at any thing, which passed) is a most grosse and impudent imposture.

23

*F. Parsons* exhortations were the students onely informations.

*Cap. 10. fol. 141.* It is affirmed, That the two Priests who were deteyned as prisoners at *Rome*, were presently set at libertie vpon the sight of the Breue, and assurance, that neither they nor any of their side in *England* would euer stirre more in these affaires. Which may euidently appeare to bee most false: for the Breue was brought vnto them within two or three dayes after the date thereof, which is 6. *Aprilis*: and the whole Colledge will witnesse, that one of them was not set at libertie, vntill the 6. of *May* following: although the other had this libertie vpon the 22. of *April*.

24

*Fol. 143.* There is very good vse made of the false dating of the Breue, which is knowen to haue bene vpon the sixth. of *April 1599.* and not long before, that is fol. 140. it is twice so cited. Yet here, for the credit of *F. Parsons*, the Reader must take the Breue to beare date the 21. of the said moneth.

25

A marueilous presumption of the blinde reader his dulnesse.

*Fol. 154.* It is sayd, that *M. Charnock* being at *Paris*, it was there resolved that he should go into *England* vnder pretence of lacke of meanes to liue abroad: and that onely for fashions sake hee should aduise *Card. Burghesius*: which is very false, as the principall of our Nation then liuing in *Lorayne* can testifie: *M. Charnock* haueing been there almost a yeere, and neuer receiued any thing from them, who confined him there, nor from *England*, notwithstanding he had written diuers times, both to *Rome*, and into *England* for some maintenance as some of them haue testified

26

This Author should haue shewed what meanes *M. Charnock* had to liue in *Lorraine*.



fied in their letters to the Archpr. dated the 11. of April 1608. from Liuerdune.

27

A shameles dif-  
fembling of the  
cause of these  
present contro-  
uersies.

*Fol. 168.* This Author inueigheth bitterly against the priests: and would haue his Reader most ridiculously to thinke that the priests had no iust cause to stirre, as now they doe, but that they tooke occasion (as hee sayeth) *upon an angry Epistle* of the Archpriests vnto them, and most impudently quoteth a place in the priests booke to his Holines, pag. 62. where his Reader may see, that the contents of that Epistle was a publication that they were schismatiks, and that hee had receiued such a resolution from Rome, which we leaue to any indifferent man to iudge, whether it was a iust cause for the priests to stirre for the purging themselues of this wicked slander.

28

*Fol. 177.* This Author boldly demaundeth touching the two priestes who were imprisoned at Rome, among other questions (all which will bee answered in their places) *had they not licence after all examinations made to goe and speake with his Holines if they would?* Whereas all the English Nation then in Rome wil testifie, that they were kept close prisoners long after their examinations were made, and the one not dismissed out of prison, vntill two dayes after that the other was departed from Rome: by which it appeareth, that they were not together at liberty after their first imprisonment, nor licensed to goe to speake with his Hol.

29

A most malici-  
ous suggestion.

*Cap. 13. fol. 201.* It is affirmed that M. Bensted was pursued so narrowly vp and downe London, soone after conference with D. Bagshaw, as he was taken neere the Tower, and soone after made away, in recompense of this his contradiction to the D. *For so good friends* (saith this fellow in this place) *are the persecutors vnto them, as none that dissent, or disagree from them shall finde any fauour.* And to make this Narration seeme the more probable, the priest himselfe is brought in, as a witnes hereof by a latter letter. But this falshood is so notorious, and knowen to be so great, and so wicked, as the spreaders of this libell blotted it out in some bookes themselues, and pasted thereon a piece of paper, as if they had been ashamed thereof. Yet did they let many books passe vncorrected perchance to such, as they presumed would beleue any thing they said, without further examination.



mination. And to make some kinde of recōpence for this their wickednesse, they haue set a few lines at the end of their *Appendix* to the *Apology*: but indeed they haue committed a greater wickednesse by iterating the accusation in this maner, *Moreouer in the Apology pa. 201. the Reader is to omit the 9. lines immediately following these words, Thus farre wrote that good priest, &c. for that something is therein mistaken through the mistaken date of one of M. Bensted's letters, whereby a former letter of his was taken for a later. His first apprehension was verily thought to proceede of treachery, vpon some free speeches of his with some malecontents: but his second taking which hapened at Lincolne, seemeth to haue been by a meere chance after his breach from Wisbich, and soone after he was put to death. What man of iudgment wil not discouer a notorious malice in this author: who would so peremptorily affirme, that M. Bensted did testifie by a later letter, that he was taken, and soon after made away in recompēce of this his contradiction: and afterward seem to salue it with a mistaken date of a letter: as though the letter bearing this or that date could deceiue the Reader in a matter of so great weight.*

A new found  
meanes to de-  
fame men.

*Cap. 13 fol. 207. It is sayd, how that as soone as euer the priests vnderstood, that their twomeffengers were restrained in Rome, and not like to preuaile: then D. Bagthaw was sent for from Wisbich to London to treat with the Councel, &c. which cannot but be a very shameles vntrueth, all England knowing that he was sent for vp not long after Michaelmas about Squires Spanish treasons: and it is well knowen that the priests were not restrained in Rome vntill the 11. of December, as is confessed in the Apologie, cap. 9 fol. 121.*

30

A most grosse  
slip.

By these few his Reader may see, how bold a face he hath to prefixe in the beginning of his *Apologie* this saying of S. Augustine: *Doe you know to distinguish betweene true, and false; betweene solide, and puffed vp; betweene turbulent, and quiet; between swelling, and sound; betweene probations, and criminations; betweene instructions, and fictions; betweene handling the cause, and running frō the cause? If you know this: well, and good: if you know it not, we are not sory that we haue had this care to instruct you. For albeit your heart be not turned to peace, yet our peace returneth to vs. Yet to make some flourish in this kinde, and that his Reader*

C

should



should be possessed with a conceit of an infinite heape of slanders, calumniationes, and contumelious speeches pretended to be vsed in the bookes against which he writeth, he giueth him *a taste* (as he sayth) in some few places taken out of the bookes, as they doe lie, by way of a Table: which he intituleth in this maner.

### C H A P. 3.

*An answer to those calumniationes which the Apologie-maker setteth out in a Table intituled, Of certaine principall deceites, falshoods and slanders.*

**P***Arturiunt Montes:* who doeth not expect some very great wonder? VWho hauing but one eare, or a credulous head, would not at this first encounter take the Priestes for no other, then strange monsters? But alas how will this good man blush (if he be not past shame) when it shalbe discouered, how litle worth the noting, he bringeth forth any thing, but the fruite of an idle and distempered braine? of which in these few words he hath giuen a sufficient argument, knowing that this Table is not of *deceites contained in the two bookes* (as he promiseth) but onely in one, and so telleth his Reader at the ende of the Table: *That he meaneth not to cite any thing of the other, for breuities sake.* But marke I pray you, what *deceites, falshoods, and slanders* are here set downe for *principall*: and by those you may gesse what he would say, if he might.

Out of the latine booke dedicated to his Holinesse, pag 1. he hath found no lesse, then five or sixe *deceites, shiftes, and falshoodes*. But if you will know what they are, you must goe looke in the xj. Chap. of the *Apologie*, where we haue also discouered his exceptions to be no other, then five or sixe fond calumniationes. He would not tell you here, what they were, either because he would not so soone discredite himselfe: or els because (imitating Painters throughout all this worke, aswel as Poets) the top of his Table shall present nothing to his Reader.

In the second page, as he saith, where the priests complaine of the persecution of the one side, and their oppression on the other



other side, he findeth great fault, or promiseth to prooue, *that few of them haue bene wounded or put to death, but rather cberished, to make an opposition against the whole body.* He citeth *cap. 10, 11, 12, and 13.* But if there should be a recitall made of such, as haue bene put to death, and the priests named, there would very few be found, that haue fauoured the proceedings of the Iesuits. And if any priests haue lately found more fauour, then either themselves, or other heretofore haue had, it hath bene (as I suppose) in regard that the Councell hath lately perceiued a difference of priests from Statists: and what indignities the priests haue, and doe daily suffer, because they will not run the Iesuits courses, but oppose themselves rather against their falshood, with all due respect to the whole body of which they are members: and the contrary is not shewed in this *Apologie*, either in the 10, 11, 12, or 13. Chapter. For in the tenth there are onely a fewe foolish coniectures, that M. Doct. *Bagshaw* wrought some matters with the Councell (when he was sent for vp to London to his answere about the treason wrought by *Squier*, being by him charged therewith at *Fa. Walpole* the Iesuits direction in Spaine.) In the 11. Chapter there is scarce one word to this purpose. In the 12. there is a bare assertion, as there is here in some foure or fise lines. In the 13. chapter this authour indeede inlargeth himselfe vpon this matter, and is emboldened vpon a letter of M. *Th. Bluet*, which by the contents seemeth not to be his: *Bluet* being therein named among others, and altogether spoken of in the third person, not in the first, as Englishmen vse to speake, when they mention any thing concerning themselves and others ioyntly. As for example our phrase is, *we shall be*, not, *they shall be*, if the writer be one himselfe. And to say that he vsed such a phrase, to couer himselfe, is too grosse: for if he would haue covered himselfe, he would not haue set his name downe at the end of the letter, *Yours Thomas Bluet*. But of this we will say no more vntill we come to answere the 13. Chapter of the *Apologie*, when it shall be further examined. The second demonstration which this *Apologie* maketh of *deceit, falshood and slander*, is out of this same place cited. *And as for their oppression* (saith he) *it is none, but such as they list to imagine, when they cannot haue their owne licen-*



*tious will in all things.* What the oppression is, I leaue it to any indifferent man to iudge, when Catholike priests, leauing all other liuelihoods, which either in England they might haue had, before they tooke vpon them this state of life, or otherwise out of England, as many haue at this day, in requitall of many yeeres hazard of their liues to saue mens soules, without any Ecclesiasticall liuing, or other meanes for their maintenance, then the charitie of such, to whom they minister the Sacraments, are turned out to goe picke sallets: and all Catholikes, who will be accounted pious and zealous, are forbidden their company, vnlesse the priests wil yeeld to their owne most vniust diffamations, and damne their owne soules in following the licentious will of the Iesuits, and Archpr. who would haue them to accuse themselues, that they haue liued, and ministred the Sacraments in schisme. And if any thing be brought in the 1. 5. 6. or 7. chapter as here is promised contrary to this, it shal be conuincd of *deceite, falshood or slander.*

Out of the fourth page in the Latine booke, there is *deceit, falshood, or slander*, prooued in these words: *Cogimur, &c. We are forced to fly to the feet of his Holines, &c.* But this matter is sufficiently answered by the Priests presence in Rome: which was with as much speed as conueniently they could make. And if they had neuer gone, their sending of this book to his Holines would iustifie as much, as is here set downe, by them: and if (notwithstanding those means which the priests did vse) their *appellation*, and consequently this booke, wherein the *appellation* is, neuer came to his Holines, it is made more euident, how necessary the printing of these bookes was, that some one by one meanes or other, might by good chance light into his Holines hands. And by this is answere made to the next place, taken out of the 5. page, where this *deceit, falshood, and slander* is found. *Hac autem, &c. Wee are forced to diuulge these things in print,* where diuers other causes are also giuen of the printing. And to this purpose there was the last yeere a little booke printed at Paris, and dedicated to the *Nuntius* there residing, entituled, *Rationes redditæ pro impressione, &c.*

Out of the 6. page, where there is no one worde spoken of Card. Allen, but how he was a common father to all the Priests, and



and how by his wisdom he kept all things in quiet, there is gathered by this Author a certaine principall deceit, falshood, or slander, which is proued because he was opposite vnto the Priests and their factious proceeding, especially against the Fathers of the society, as by his owne letters appeareth a little before his death, &c. See Apol. cap. 4. and 7. See the finenesse of this fellowes wit, how hee can discover a deccit, falshood, or slander. The priests doe not say in that place, that hee was either with them or against them, or with the Fathers or against them: but only make a plaine narration of his wisdom, and the reuerence which all did beare vnto him. And as for the 4. Chap. (to which wee are here referred) there is nothing of Card. Allen his writing concerning our matters, neither could there well be, he being dead before these begun. In the 7. Chap. there is a certaine remembrance of a letter of his to M. Musb, which for so much of it, as is set downe in the second Chapter, it condemneth the priests no more, then the Iesuits: betweene whome belike hee had heard there was some priuate questions: of which, what his iudgement was, it is very well knowen to some, and hath beene confessed by other: namely Doct. Haddocke, that the Card. before his death had such disgust of the Iesuites their actions, as this good Doctor being tolde by M. Charnocke what was reported in England to haue proceeded from a Iesuite, tooke vpon him perchance to saue then the Iesuites credit (for now they say hee denyeth it againe) that it was hee himselfe who had vsed these words after the Cardinals death. *He is well dead, for if he had liued, he had greatly dishonoured himselfe and his countrey.*

In the 7. page, there is a principall deceit, falshood, or slander, noted in these words: *Desudantibus, &c. While Seminary Priests did sweate in the haruest of England, which haruest was then well manured, and almost ripe, some Iesuits were called in by Doct. Allen to helpe them, &c.* But what are these falshoods? and how are they prooued? Forsooth, for first (sayth this good fellow) *how well manured and ripe the English Cath. haruest was 22. yeeres agoe, when the Iesuits were first sent, there being then but few Priests in England, as hauing had but one onely Scminary vntill that time, and fewe known Catholikes, also in respect of the number, that after had ensued, this we say, is knowen to all men that vnderstood our case.*



Iohn 4.

We are not here to stand vpon the encrease of Catholikes, which hath beene within these 22. yeeres: for no doubt there haue bene more knowen, then were before. And if the Iesuits will take it vpon them, that they haue beene greater encreasers of Catholikes then the Secular priests, they will discouer in themselues too much both falshood and vanitie. And as for the exception which is taken against that which is saide of the *good manuring of the haruest in England*, and that it was *almost ripe before the Iesuits came in*, hee might as well haue taken exception, and prooued *falshood* and *vanity* in our Sauour his words, when he said, *Leuate oculos vestros, & videte regiones, quia alba sunt iam ad messum, &c.* Lift vp your eyes, and behold the countrey, how ready it is now for haruest. And this was spoken by Christ onely vpon the disposition which he saw in the Samaritanes to receiue his doctrine. And as the number of Priests was not so great as now it is, so was it not so small as this fellow would it should be thought, and both the Priests and laity had suffered long before the Iesuites set foot into England: and there was perchance more true & sincere religion in the least household, then now is in a wider compasse, what faire shewes soeuer are outwardly made to delude the world. And whereas it is here said, that when the Iesuits came into England, there was but one onely Seminary, it is as false as the other was foolish: For as it is set downe in the first Chapter of the *Apol. fol. 2.* the first English Seminary began at *Doway* in the yere 1568. and neuer as yet failed, although vpon occasion it hath beene translated from thence into France, and backe againe now to *Doway*: so there is also mention in the same Chapter *fol. 3.* of the beginning of the English Colledge at Rome in the yeere 1578. which was before the Iesuits entrance into England, as may be prooued out of the 12. Chapter of the same *Apologie, fol. 181.* where *F. Parsons* is said to haue come into England betwixt Easter and Whitsontide in the yeere 1580. where he must needs heare of some priests, who had beene sent from that Seminary before him. T. W. in his *disgression from 16. Martyrs in one yere*, pag. 52. sayth, that the Colledge of Rome was founded in the yeere 1575. which was five yeeres before *F. Parsons* entrance into England. And as I thinke no man doubteth, but that *Fa. Parsons,*



*Parsons*, and *Fa Campion* were the first Iesuits, which were sent into England to labour in that haruest. As for those generall letters, which follow in reproofe of these supposed falshoods, they shalbe answered, where this Author setteth them downe in perticular.

In the 8. page *F. Heywood* the Iesuit is said to bee falsly, and maliciously belied in these words: *Ostentans se, &c. A certaine Iesuit vaunting himselfe among our people, as though he had bene Legate to the Sea Apostolicke, &c.* But you must go for prooffe hereof to the 3. chap. (where there is nothing to this purpose) and to the 11. chap. where *fol. 164*, *F. Heywood* is thus cleared from this pretended false, and malicious lye. *Onely it is true, that some 16. or 17. Priests (whereof one chiefe man is said to be of their faction at this day) met together with him, (that is F. Heywood) and would haue had all the Nationall customes of England about fasting (for some little diuersitie, and difficulties, which they found in them) to be reduced to the common order of the Romane Church, which D. Allen, F. Parsons, M. Blackwell, and others did not allow: and F. Heywood yeelded vnto these mens opinions.* And thus much perchance should not haue bene said here, had *Fa. Parsons*, and *Fa. Heywood* bene friends: but they being otherwise, and the good *Fa. Heywood* reclayming himselfe, and seeking reformation of many things in men of his order (for which cause, notwithstanding his learning and other gifts, he was made to liue, and die very obscurely) the Author of this *Apologie* is content to say somewhat of him in this case in question: although so farre as it might touch the credit of the societie, the blame is layed vpon the Secular priestes. And because perchance it is too well knowen, that some of those priests (otherwise zealous men, as by their death they made euident remonstrance) did long after breake those fasts vpon the warrant of this Prouinciall Councell, it is said that *F. Heywood* yeelded vnto the contrary opinion, lest the societie should beare the discredit of so rash an attempt. And thus is the calumniation answered, which was made against *F. Heyw.* and no otherwise, as the reader may see, if he will turne to the places whither this Author sendeth him. And it cannot but argue great want of shame in this Author, to run with such fowle termes vpon men for saying that,  
which



which when he cometh to salue, he knoweth not almost, how to deliuer otherwise with any likelyhood of trueth.

In the 9 page the *principall deceit, falshood, or slander*, is noted in these words: *Pari etiam modo, &c. In like maner the Rectors of our English Romane Colledge did goe about many things, that were grieuous, and asperous to our youthes.* But for this point you must see it handled at large *cap. 5. Apol.* where also it is to be answered, or the Reader referred to some particuler treatise of this matter. But in the same page, there is an other *slander*, that is: *Conspēctis, &c. Card. Allen*, after he had considered, and discovered the endeauors of the Iesuits, was wont to say, *that they sought more their owne good, then either that of our Countrey, or Colledge.* The prooffe hereof must now stand vpon the honesty of the Relators: but how iustly he, or any other might speake it, I refer me to any indifferent mans iudgement, when the Iesuits would neuer suffer any to be in rest in the College, who would not suffer theselues to be drawne to the societie either by them, or their Agents, who liuing in the Colledge, as the other students did, had secret vowes to be Iesuits, and perswaded, as many as they could, to take the same course. And England hauing more need to be furnished with such, as were most fit to take vpon them the care of soules, who can doubt whether the Iesuits in seeking the most towardly youthes to leaue their vocation, and become of their order, *sought more their owne good, then either that of our Countrey, or Colledge?* And to the question here foolishly proposed, *what priuate good can the Iesuits pretend for themselves worth their labors, and perils in England, more then in the Indies, except the good of soules, and seruice of God?* As though they sought somewhat els in the Indies, then the good of soules, and seruice of God, or at the least not so much, as in England; We answere both according to their proceedings, and *F. Parsons* platforme of *Reformation*, that whatsoever they pretend, they seeke to keepe not onely the Secular priests in a seruile subiection vnto them, but the Bishops also, and all the whole State of England: hauing already in their platforme or *Councell of Reformation* set downe all Ecclesiasticall men, as pensioners, at the discretion of some Iesuits, and some Secular priests, no doubt of their choosing, for auoyding of cōtention, & diuision. And whereas  
(good



(good man) he talketh of the Iesuits labours, and perils in England, who knoweth not, how deliciously they fare, how gorgeously they are attired, how quietly they sleepe in the best, and safest houses in England? insomuch as it is a marueilous wonder, when any Iesuit is in perill. And there hath not wanted among the Lay gentlemen, that for these respects haue wished themselves Iesuits, notwithstanding they haue liued with wife, children, great friends, and as great contentment, as this world can yeeld to wealthy protected Catholicks.

In the 11. page is this falshood noted or slander against Card. Tolet, in that he is said to haue bene a fauourer of the Troublesome against their superiors: the wordes are these: *Iam tum, &c.* At that time both the Colledge, and al the schollers had bene vndone, if Car. Toledo had not opposed himselfe, as a wall for the said schollers. This is iustified by many: and in the particular discourse of the troubles in Rome, it will be shewed, notwithstanding this vant here of all Rome, and his Holinesse, as though they would witness the contrary.

In the 12. page this Author hath noted great falshood in the narration of the stirres of *Wisbich*, and telleth his Reader in his religious termes, how the priests doe calumniate Weston, and the bigger and better part, because they liued in order, and retired themselves from these mens licentiousnes, and for more prooffe hereof his reader must goe looke in the 6. chapter of the *Apologie*, where hee is like to finde many vntrueths vttered by his Author, which are already discovered in a relation set out of those matters.

In the 15. page (which hee calleth the 13.) hee noteth this falshood, that the priests called themselves vnited: *Laicorū, &c.* The Iesuits did alienate Lay mens mindes ab vnitis sacerdotibus, from the vnited priests: note (sayth he) the phrase of vnited, they being farre the lesse number, and diuided both from their head, and the rest of their body the English Clergie. It is as the Hollanders doe call their rebelled states against the King, The vnited Prouinces, &c. Note, say I, how this fellow abuseth his reader, by tellinghim of a diuision against a head, where there was none, but voto only, that is to say, by a religious desire, which was in Fa. Weston the Iesuite, who would be director of all the priests in *Wisbich*, to which

D

because



because some would not consent, he and his company diuided themselves from them, which being an vniust, and a scandalous separation, the other priests, who remained in their former course of life, might iustly call themselves *united*, as men, who properly kept the *union*, when the other made such a diuision as they would not haue any commerce with them, vpon their idle toy of *Reformation*, vnder pretence whereof the Iesuits ha-ving gotten the superiority, the priests must yeeld to what conditions they would offer, or the whole countrey must be in an vprore: yet will these men challenge the name of *united*. But let euery indifferent man iudge, which part did most liuely represent a rebellious state. And for the further prooue of this fellow his malicious impostures (for it is not possible that hee should haue hereof any ignorance) let any indifferent reader looke vpon that discourse cited here by him out of the Latine booke, and it will bee as cleere as noone day, that there is no mention of any other matter, then of the diuision wrought at *Wisbich* by the Iesuites and their faction, some yeeres before the Archpriest was instituted, and consequently before there was any other head or whole body of the English Clergie, then that, from which the Iesuits and their factious adherents diuided themselves.

In the 16. page this Author discovereth another *principall deceit, falshood, or slander*, in these words: *Ticonius ille Donatista, &c. That Ticonius the Donatist, &c.* Note (saith he) *the spirit of these men, they compare al the good, and quiet prisoners in Wisbich Donatists, for that they retired themselves from these mens tumultuous, and scandalous life, and put themselves vnder rule. See cap 6. Apolog.* Are not these wordes, *Ticonius ille Donatista*, shrewd wordes, that doe inferre such large consequences? are not rather these tumultuous, and scandalous termes, and irreligious exceptions against the life of Catholike priests, and some of them long prisoners for the Catholike faith, an euident prooue of most loose and large consciences? But to make this matter more plaine against this impostor, what if there were no speech of any of the Priests? What a malicious Comment is this vpon those three words, *Ticonius ille Donatista, That Ticonius the Donatist*. Is it not most euident that the speech there vsed, concerned



cerned no one, or other more then *Fa. Weston* the Iesuit? But yet this was too much to compare him to a *Donatist*. Well, but then what if neither he were compared to a *Donatist*, nay further yet, what if in that very place *F. Weston* is shewed not to be *Ticonius the Donatist*, or a follower of him? how then can the indifferent Reader, but iudge the Author of this *Apologie* past shame, who will lay it to the Priests charge, that in this place cited, *they compare all the good, and quiet prisoners in Wisbich to Donatists?* And for what cause? Forsooth, for that they retired themselves from these mens tumultuous, and scandalous life, and put themselves under rule. Let vs therefore now see what there is in that 16. page concerning *Ticonius ille Donatista*: That *Ticonius the Donatist, &c.* Thus we read in that 16. page. *Tandem verò aliquando, ut inuidiam leniret, quam sibi, suisq; non mediocrem conflauerat, ne reuixisse videretur Ticonius ille Donatista (cuius illuderat, Quod nobis placet, sanctum est) promisit, se boni viri arbitrio rectenè an illicitè separationem fecisset statutum*: That is to say, In the ende to mollifie somewhat that great enuie which bee (*Fa. Weston*) had gotten to himselfe and his followers, he promised to stand to the iudgement of any honest man, whether he had lawfully, or unlawfully made the separation, least that *Ticonius the Donatist* should seeme to haue bene reuiued, whose saying this was, That is holy which pleaseth vs. So that by this it is euident, that not onely the priests are not compared to *Donatists*, but *F. Weston* the Iesuite is shewed not to be, as that *Donatist*, because he promised to stand to the iudgement of another: which as here is a- uouched *Ticonius the Donatist* would not doe: but would haue, that which pleased him, stand for good.

In the same page, there is another principall deceite, falshood, or slander, noted in these words, *Quorum unus, &c.* which this Author translateth thus. *One in Wisbich Castle fell out of his wit, by reason of opprobrious letters written unto him, &c.* Now he hath made his tale, as he list: see what he adioyneth. *How egregious an vntrueth this is, the whole company will testifie.* And if their words will not satisfie a reasonable man, he shall haue more witnesse. For it is most vntrue, that he fell out of his wit by reason of opprobrious letters written unto him: but by reason of opprobrious letters which himselfe had written by perswasion



of Fa. Weston the Iesuite, and other of his faction against the other Priests, as himselfe in *lucidis intervallis* confessed: and asked pardon of some of them, whom he had so iniured, as they are readie to testifie: and these two words *unto him* are added to the text in this place by the Author of the *Apologie*, as euery Grammer boy may see, who will turne vnto it.

In the 17. page, a *malicious deuise* is noted in these wordes, *Hanc verò, &c. This sodality of them that liued vnder Rules in Wisbich*, (besides many stumbling blockes, which it brought into our Church) was vehemently also suspected by the Queene and Councell. But if those words of *them that liued vnder Rules in Wisbich*, be fraudulently thrust into the text by this Authour, in whom is the *malicious deuise*, (for so it is put in the margent) *deceite, falsehood, or slander?* The words are no other then these. *Hanc verò sodalitatem, præterquam quod offendicula multa inueheret in Ecclesiam nostram, paciꝑ funesta esset, & vehementer principi, magistratibusꝑ suspecta, quod patribus Iesuitis alias, atque alias inuasiones hostiles continuo machinantibus in regnum plus aquo tribueret, & quasi totum Clerum iisdem subderet, videbat ille arbiter nullam habere benè instituta Communitatis formam, monstriꝑ simile esse, vt vnus pater Iesuita, membrum vnius corporis, caput fieret alterius, &c.* That is to say, *This sodalitie, besides the many impediments it brought into our Church, and was incompatible with peace, and vehemently suspected by the Prince, and Magistrates, in that it gaue more, then was fit to the Fa. Iesuites, who sundrie wayes busied themselves in hostile inuasions of our Countrey, and as it were made all the Cleargie subiect vnto them, the arbiter sawe, that it had no forme of any well framed Communitie, and that it was like vnto a monster, that one Fa. Iesuite, beeing a member of one bodie, should bee made the head of another body, in which some were, who in regard of their more auncient order of Religion, some in regarde of their degree of Doctorshippe, some for their venerable age, many for their wisedome, learning and vertue, farre his betters, &c.* By which it may appeare to the indifferent Reader, howe carelesse this Authour is, what he sayth, so he may make somewhat sounde for his purpose. And to the ende hee might bring the Priestes into obloquie, he will for a colour bring some two or three of their owne wordes,



wordes, and ioyned somewhat thereunto of his owne, and then runne a while vpon that: as in this place, hauing thrust in those words, *Of them that liued vnder Rules in Wisbitch*, he maketh this Comment; *Great stumbling blockes, that a few pious Rules of modest life in a few prisoners could bring into our whole Church.* Whereas the place here cited by this Authour, giueth him no occasion to frame such a conceite, but pleadeth the indgement giuen against that sodalitie by him, who was chosen arbiter in the cause.

And whereas he also affirmeth, *That if this sodalitie were suspected by the Prince, it must needs be that the Priests had maliciously perswaded, that it (as also the institution of the Archpriest) was not for Religion, but for matter of state*, The Iesuites knowen practises against the State, mentioned in the place, which is cited by this Authour, conuince, that there was no such neede, that the Priestes should vse any perswasions to the Prince, or Magistrates: and that no plot in gathering a head vnder a Iesuites direction, could bee free from suspition, as shall be shewed more at large, where the Author shall find his place in the *Apologie* to giue other colour to the Iesuites actions.

In the 19. page vpon those words: *Dom. Standisium, &c. M. Standish, who had giuen his name to be a Iesuite*, This Author inferreth a pretie conclusion. *All are Iesuites with these men, who are not of their faction, the Archpriest and all:* in which (to omit his folly) how doth he shew in that place any principall deceit, falsehood or slander? or not being able to gainsay that, which the priests sayd: how shamelesly, or rather childishly doeth hee shift it?

In the 20 page there is exception taken against that which is mentioned of *F. Weston* his being taken dumbe, and falling downe: and it is called an *impudent fiction, refuted by authenticall testimonies of all the quiet prisoners in Wisbich*: and you must goe looke for this in the 6. Chapter of the *Apol.* where you may find it contrary if you can. For answer to this, we are to referre the Reader to the particular narration of the stirres in *Wisbich*.

In the 21. page the principall deceit, falsehood, or slander, is shew-



ed in these words, *Consilium iniuimus, &c.* We tooke a counsel together for appointing prouosts and superiors ouer vs in opportune places of the kingdome &c. It was death for this good fellow to go any further in the narration, which here he doth calumniate: for if he had added these words (which are part of the sentence cited by him with an &c. all which Prouosts and superiours should haue bene chosen by the free suffrages of the Priests, his falshood would haue bene discovered, which he sheweth here in these words. *This was the worke of their* (the priests) *association, whereby a few busie and ambitious men tooke vpon them to be Counsellors of State without Commission, or consent of the rest of the Clergie, or licence of their superiours, to appoint dignities to themselves, and others at their pleasures, and to make a new sedition.* And if the reader will vouchsafe to turne to that 21. page, hee shall see that this author is little to bee credited in his relations, and may wonder, that he will so shamelesly behaue himselfe, as euery indifferent man must condemne him of exceeding great falshood, and direct intention to deceiue his reader. And because he referreth his reader to the letters of the assistants, and other proofes, cap. 8. & 9. there we will make our answere vnto them for so much as is there touched in this matter.

In the 23. page these words are cited, *Quid interea P. Parsonius, &c.* What did F. Parsons in this meane space, the Author, incensor and actor of all our perturbations, &c. But nothing being in this place answered to that which in the 23. page is sayde against him, we are not to stand vpon those other matters which are here mentioned. It sufficeth that there is nothing conuincd of deceit, falshood, or slander: to which ende the table maker brought this place out of the latine booke.

In the 26. page M. Blackwell is said to be slandered, and that these were spiteful speeches against him: *Videns autem D. Blackwell, &c.* M. Blackwell seeing this, &c. where in the Latine booke mention is made of a letter he writ to the Card Caietane: the letter is out in print, and whosoeuer wil take the paines to read it shall see, that there is nothing but the truth set downe in the place here cited by this authour. And whereas here it is vrged, that he is named euery where without any reuerence at al, they will hardly finde him named, but Master Blackwell, which is as much



much reuerence as is due vnto him for any thing the Priestes know. And if he be sometime called *the Archpriest*, it is as much as this Authour giueth him, as may be scene in many places. Moreouer, if there be any thing to the contrary in the 4, 10, or 11. chap. of the *Apologie*, it shall be there answered.

In the 27. page, a *principall deceit, falshood, or slander* is noted, where it is said: *Cum omnes, &c. Whereas all Iesuits almost in England be children of poore parents, &c.* And to this, what answer is here made? Forsooth *how manifestly false and shamelesse this is, there needes no other prooffe but to know the parties: and to consider also, what manner of children, and of what parents they be that doe obiekt this, &c.* But alas (good man) were they much worse then they are, who are saide to obiekt this, they are by many degrees his betters, who is taken to be the Author of this *Apologie*. And if the priests had as impertinently spoken so of the Iesuits, as this good fellow speaketh of the priests, his folly might haue bene in some sort excused: but it being euident, that this fellow his speech proceedeth of splene, and without either any necessitie to inlarge himselfe so farre, or any furtherance to his cause, (for what doth the quality of this or that man, make better or worse the qualitie of another?) the place noted in this 27. pag. doth shew a iust cause, why the priests did say the trueth in that cause. For whereas M. *Blackwell* (to the ignominie of the Catholike gentlemen) did most vngratefully suggest, and most vtruely to the Card. *Caietane*, that the Iesuits did maruails in England in the releeuing of all sorts of people distressed, and that they did it *out of their owne patrimonies*, because they were *minima*, not worth the speaking of, which they receiued of almes from the Catholikes: the priests, to shew how palpable this flattery was, affirmed (as they might iustly) that *all the Iesuites almost in England were children of poore parents*: and consequently not like to doe so much, & in that sort, as M. *Blackwell* did most grossely suggest. And let this be sufficient for this time vpon this occasion, to prooue that it is no *calumniation*, as the margent would haue the reader to thinke it, nor *deceit, falshood, or slander*, as this table is entituled.

In the 29. page are diuers things noted, as that *Pope Xistus was tearmed a Wolfe by the Iesuites, and defamed as a most wicked man,*



man, and certaine propositions maintained about the Stewes, which will be iustified to haue beene vttered by F. Weston the Iesuite in defence of M. Archer one of his principal confederates in his faction at *Wibich*, and generally taken for a Iesuite, and cannot therefore but appertaine to the Iesuits, betweene whome soeuer the controuersie first began.

In the 30. page the priestes are saide to call the authoritie of their superior, instituted by Christs vicar, *Laruum*: that is, *a masking vizard*: which is very false; and no modest man would haue auowched it out of that place, it sounding no otherwise, then thus: *ad dominium componendum alienae personae larua utendum putabant*: that is, *they (the Iesuits) to get dominion, thought they must use a maske of an other person*; which can beare no other sence then this: that they would rule, and an other should beare the name: and if ought were done amisse, it should neuer be knowne who were the actors. But this man must be seene in it: and they must be couered by him: which euery man knoweth to be a very ordinary course in the world, & cry out shame vpon it, without any touch to authority, but to the abuse thereof. And whereas *Fa. Parsons memorials* are here said to bee yet extant, intreating for obteyning of Bishops, it is no disproofe to that, which is auowched by the priestes: it being so possible for the same man to vrge mightily the very same matter, which he will, by some meanes, or other, crosse. And there is sufficient proofe of this kind of dealing in *F. Parsons*: as for example. At the parting of some students from Rome, hee writ a letter of commendations in the behalfe of one of them, and at the very same time hee writ as much to the contrary to the very same place: insomuch as they to whom those letters came, conferring them together, could not but maruaile much at this falsehood in him. Likewise when M.D. *Bishop* was to depart from Rome to Paris, in the way of great friendship and confidence, *F. Parsons* requesteth him, that there might be intercourse of letters betweene them: Mary one thing aboue the rest he earnestly comended vnto him: and that was, to certifie him from time to time of M.D. *Cecill* his carriage, and at the same time he writ to M.D. *Cecill* to doe him the like fauour for M.D. *Bishop*. And not long after he sollicitated M. *Shelborne* (a reuerend priest then



then abiding in Paris) to certifie him against them both: and very likely it was, there was some other appointed to pay his debts. But imagine what sport there was when these letters came forth: and how peeuish they are, who will not belecue that *F. Parsons* can play all maner of playes for his purpose.

In the 33. page the *principall deceit, falshood, or slander* is gathered out of those wordes, *Nulla &c. no respect being had to the most Catholike Archb. of Glasco*. I would aske this good fellow what respect was had vnto this Bishop, when the Archpriest was made superior without his priuitie or consent ouer all the English priests which then were, or after should be resident in his diocesse? And if there were no respect had vnto him, what *deceit, falshood or slander* was there in saying so? But listen I pray you to the conceit which is made hereupon. See (saith he) *the strange desire of these men to set strife euery where. They would stirre vp the Archb. of Glasco residing in Paris for aboue 30. yeres against the Protector: for that he giueth iurisdiction to the Archpriest vpon English Priests in England, Scotland and Ireland, and yet these men do aske faculties for these three countries, but would be vnder no authority in any*. Now alas (good man) where hath he his ground concerning this last point, that *the priests would not be vnder authority*? so often as hee doeth vrge the association intended in England by the Priests, hee conuinceth himselte of this falshood: And if he were set to finde, where the Priests asked faculties for those three countries as superiors there, he would be sorely troubled. But the Reader must take all this vpon his word: as also that the Priests minded to set the *Protector*, and the Bishop of *Glasco* together by the eares, when they said that in the institution of this authoritie ouer all the English priests in Scotland, there was no respect had to the Catholick Bishop of *Glasco*. How much better might it be said that *F. Parsons* and his confederats ment to set strife betweene them, when so vnaduisedly they procured the *Protector* to giue such iurisdiction to a strange Archpriest within the dioces of a Bishop in another Nation, and no way subiect to any prelate of England? In this foolish fury also, how forgetteth he that he often saith that the Cardinall did but witnes the authoritie by his letters, and setteth it downe in plaine termes, *that the Priest would stirre vp*  
E
the



*the Bishop against the Protector, for that he giueth iurisdiction to the Archpriest?* In the *Apologie* almost in euery place, it is said that there was in the Priests at the first comming of the Cardinals letters no lesse, then a resistance against the Popes order; and how then was not the danger of stirring vp the Bishop against his Holines, but against the *Protector*?

In the 35. page and so forward to the 59. many things are noted, for which the Reader must goe looke in the *Apologie*.

In the 61. page a principall deceit, falsehood, or slander is noted in these words. *His visis, &c. As soone as we saw the Apostolicall letters of the new Breue for confirmation of the Archpriest; we all presently submitted our selues &c.* This is so manifest and so often acknowledged by all from the highest to the lowest, as there shal neede no further iustifying thereof: But this author would haue his reader conceiue that this submission was *fained and forced*, and that the euent shewed so much: and that it could not be otherwise, the Priests hauing entred with the Counsell so farre, as they had done, as is shewed Cap. 10. & 13. where (saith this fellow) we shew, by their owne letters, their conspiracie with the persecutor. But in conclusion if you doe not trust him vpon his wordes more, then vpon his proofes which he bringeth either in the 10 or 13 Chap. you must hold him still for such as he is. We haue already sayd enough hereof in the defence of that, which hee commenteth vpon those words, *Hinc à communi &c. p. 2.* as he hath cited it in the beginning of this his table of deceits, to which we remit you for this time; and omitting that which here he saith, that the submission of the priests was *forced*: which implyeth a true submission (nothing being inforced, but their wil to accept of him against whom they had many iust exceptions) I will onely note how falsly, and deceitfully this good fellow vseth this place, which thus he hath cited, out of the 61. page. *His visis &c. As soone as we saw the Apostolicall letters of the new Breue, &c.* what can his reader thinke of these words, *the new Breue*; but that there was som former *Breue*, which was not obeyed by the priests? And to this purpose, as in other places, so in his first Chap. of his *Apol. fol. 8.* he vseth the same deceit, *He (the Pope) confirmed all that was done already by the Card. with a new Breue:* where also in the margent this note is made, *A new Breue*



*Breue 1599.* lest any man should thinke it a worde spoken by chance, and not of purpose, and it is the more apparant in this place, which now we handle, because he hath falsly translated the priests words, and made them to talke of a *new Breue*. For thus he alleageth them. *Hu visis &c.* As soone as we saw the *Apostolicall letters of the new Breue for confirmation of the Archpriest*, we all presently submitted our selues to him: where *Hu visis*, that is, *these being seene*, is onely referred to these words, *Sanctitatis tuae litera*: that is, *the letters of your Holines*: And there is no other mention, of any other *Apostolicall letters*, or any other *Breue*, much lesse any *Apostolicall letters of a new Breue*, as it may be seene by them, who will turne to the place.

In the 69. page a principall deceit, falshood, or slander, is gathered out of those words, *Archipresbyter, &c.* The Archpriest denieth accesse vnto him, he will not be seene, he doth disdain to talke with his brethren, &c. But how is this proued deceit, falshood, or slander? Forsooth thus. *All things are rhetorically exaggerated*, yet it is no maruaile though the Archpriest do vse some moderation, and circumspection in admitting those men to speach, whom hee knoweth to haue an euill mind towards him, and to deale with the Councel, and Bishop of London, and to seeke his speech onely to braule, and to take some aduantage at his words: as two of them did, who accused him of an hereticall proposition in talking with him presently vpon the arriual of his first commission. Had this fellow onely giuen a cause, why the Archpriest would not talke with the priests, without any more adoe, it had been a little signe of some small grace in him: but to bring that in for a *deceit, falshood, or slander*, which he cannot denie, but must confesse to be true, and straineth himselfe to giue a cause thereof, it is too shamefull. It being then euident, that the Archpriest will not speake with the priests, let vs see how good these causes are, and how true, which are here alleaged. The first is, *because hee knoweth that the Priestes haue an euill mind towards him*: but this fauoureth too much of malice. The second is, *he knoweth that they deale with the Councel and Bishop of London*: but alas this cause commeth too late, as may appeare by comparing the times together in which the Archp. hath denied to speake with the, with the times in which it hath pleased the Couñsel as he supposeth to shew them some



fauour by meanes of the Bishop of London, hauing conceiued some hope of their loyaltie towards their prince and country.

The third cause here alledged is, for that *the Archpriest knoweth, they seeke his speech, onely to brawle and to take some aduantage at his words, as two of them did, &c.* and in the margent M. Collington and M. Charnock are named. It is very likely, if the Archpriest would be so resolute, as he would agree to no reason, but run on the course he hath begun, the priests might haue parted frō him, as litle edified as M. Collington and M. Charnock did, when he sent for them & M. Heburne to speake with them, presently vpon the arriual of his first cōmission, that is, the Cardinals letters vnto him, or conuented them, as M. Standish gaue it out in the *Clinke* not long after, whereupon M. H. Henslow, who before was taken for the Archpr. messenger, was called his *Sumner*, and was very angry at it. And this particuler is brought that it may appeare, what a bold face that fellow hath, who in the *Appendix fol. 7.* affirmeth, *that it seemeth they (M. Collington, and M. Charnocke) were sent to him of purpose to catch him in his words.* And if where difference is, there must of necessity be brawling, I thinke no man doubteth, but he is the brawler who offereth the iniury, not he who vseth necessarie defence. And if moreouer M. Collington and M. Charnocke haue accused the Archp. of an heretical proposition (as this Author in this place insinuateth) I do verely perswade my selfe, that they will proue it so farre foorth as two men of their qualitie may prooue it, which would be little for M. Blackwells credit, notwithstanding the slight reckoning which is made of *their two relations onely, Cap 8 fol. 109.*

In the 83. page a principall deceit, fallshood, or slander, is noted in these words, *Plura, &c. The Iesuits doe bragge, that many more Seminaries haue beene erected by them, &c.* The Priests words are these: *Plura numero, more in number. This is very calumnious* (saith this good fellow) *but if they should speake of any such matter compelled by your slanders, should they not say truth, seeing fīue or sixe partly Seminaries, partly residences, haue beene erected by them? &c.* Well good sir, not to deuine here what slanders they were, which so happily compelled the Iesuites to speake of their so great benefits vnto the priests, I will keepe mine eye-sight for  
the



the 3, 5, 10, and 12. chap. where I am told, I ſhall ſee more of this moſt insolent ingratitude: And in the meane while I will hope that the Ieſuits of their charitie, will forgiue them all, who compelled them to ſpeake ſo much of their owne great good deeds, which, were they a thouſand times more then they are, the Ieſuites ought not to embolden themſelues, or challenge thereby a greater libertie to abuſe men at their pleaſure: and it is a ſilly prooffe, that they haue not abuſed men in one kind, becauſe that they haue done them a good turne in another. And with this the table was taken vp: for the author had no other meaning when he ſet you to this table of *principall deceits, falſhoods, and ſlanders*, then to let you haue a taſte of thoſe two libels, which the diſcontented prieſts did ſet forth, to wit, the booke dedicated to his Holines, entituled, *Declaratio motuum, A declaration of ſtirres, &c.* and the Engliſh booke entituled, *The Copies of certaine diſcourſes.*

But alas (poore man) either his wits appeare hereby to be very ſhallow, who out of an infinite heape of ſlanders, calumniation, and contumelious ſpeeches, which hee ſayth are contained in the prieſts bookes, could no better furniſh his table with *deceits, falſhoods, and ſlanders*, which here hee vndertooke: or his malice extreame great, to make ſuch a vaine glorious ſhew, where the principal ſtuffe was of no more moment, then is already ſhewed in theſe 28. pickt points, to diſcredit the *Latine* booke and the authors thereof, who alwayes haue, & will ſhew, that they meane better then hee doth, and tend to that place to which honeſt prieſts ſhould tend, and hope to arriue in the end: whence it is to be feared, they ſhall behold the Author of this *Apologie* lying, and too late repenting this, and other his miſdeeds.

*The reſt that followeth in this Latine booke about the Appellation* (ſayth this Author) *as alſo about a fond and ſeditious Latine letter of M. Iohn Muſh thereon enſuing, are ſufficiently examined, Cap. 10, and 11. Apol.* But vnleſſe the 10, and 11. Chap. be too too much ouerſeene, there is no one point of the *Appellation* examined. There is ſomewhat ſaid to M. Muſh his letter in the 11. Chapter, which is little to the purpoſe. The examination of the Engliſh booke, entituled, *The Copies of diſcourſes*, is for bre-



uitie sake put off to the 1, 2, 7, and 11. *Apol.* where it is to be defended, not to haue any thing in it worthy the name of a scandall, but to a Pharisee : and thereby it will be shewed to bee a worke, fit for Catholike priests to write, and publish to the world, their case standing as then it did. And their fact will appeare the more iustificable, by how much it will appeare by the answer to this *Apologie*, that they cannot be disprooued, but by manifest *falsehoods, deceits, and slanders*. After these notes, or exceptions against the *Latine* booke, which was dedicated to his Holines vnder this title, *Declaratio motuum, &c.* march certaine principall persons, which the Reader must beleue, are iniuri- ed by the priests, and are defended by the *Apologie* : amongst which there are such placed, as the Authors might with more honestie haue made two lists : one, of those most honourable personages ; the other, of the rest : but since that they haue put them all in one companie, one answer shal serue to the whole list : that howsoeuer his Holines is here abused in the Epistle, and the honour of the honourable is touched in this *Apologie*, the priests at no time haue iniuri- ed either them, or any the other *by-hangers* : neither can the contrary be shewed, as any man (who knoweth what vse this author will make of a little) may iustly imagine, in that there is no one place cited out of the booke written by the priests, or in this *Apologie*, where any abuse is conuinc- ed. And although sometimes in this *Apologie* the author putteth his reader in mind of such matters, he doth discouer nothing, but his owne desires in some, and follie in other his exceptions, as shall be shewed when occasion is offered. And in the meane while, the discrete reader may iudge, whether this authour or publisher were not past shame, who could not but know, that the priests had bene with the *Nuntio* in Flanders, and acknowledged his authoritie. And to that end, that no principall thing be hidden from his reader, he hath after *principall deceits*, and principall persons, set down the principall authors & spreaders of the bookes, wherein these *principall deceits* are contained, & the principall persons iniuri- ed. And in naming those which he doth name for the principall authors, he hath committed a very grosse error in his Preface, where he seemeth to doubt who were the authors. And in the end he con- cludeth



cludeth thus, *So as these bookes must needs be presumed, to haue bene published either by some one, or few discomposed passionate people, or by some heretike or other enemye, to dishonour them all; and discredit our cause, and nation: and so as to such we shall answer, &c.* what man of iudgement will not say, that either the memorie of this fellow is very short, or his honestie very small, who hauing named, whom he thinketh to be the authors, maketh his answer, *as to heretikes?* And if to these be added those disgraceful speeches, which are vsed in the beginning of the 3. Chap. fol. 20. against the Authors of the bookes, impugned by the Apologie, his most audacious friendes will blush at his folly, for there very contemptuously he affirmeth, that *some of them went ouer poore seruing men, other souldiers,* (what an ingratitude, and dishonor is this to *Fa. Ignatius Laiola*, the souldier, and Iesuites founder?) *other wanderers in the world, &c.* Possibly this good mans wits are not alwaies at home, and they should doe him great iniury, who should looke for one wise worde from him, which is not put into him by some other. If he had not named those fixe for the principall authors of the books, he might with lesse shame haue vttered his foule conceite: but hauing named them, hee cannot auoide the note of a most malicious false companion, what godly pretences and promises soeuer he maketh of modestie in this Apologie.

C H A P. 4.

*How the authour of this Apologie followeth that counsell which Achitophel gaue to Absalon, 2. Reg. 16. that other seeing how hee abused his Holinesse, might the more desperately adhere vnto him.*

**T**He Epistle which followeth to his Holinesse, and is saide to be translated out of *Latine* into English, after some time of probation expired, was admitted, and annexed to the Apologie. It had bene very great pitie to haue left out so memorable an abridgement of so many impertinent, and false matters, and so well suting with the Apologie. I call all that impertinent,



pertinent, which concerneth any diuision, either of Iesuites, and other Catholikes of the Clergie, or of the Laitie, before the comming of the Cardinall *Caietans* letters, for the institution of the Archpriest in the yeere 1598. or the ambitious attempt of the known, and couert Iesuites in the scandalous diuision in *Wibich*. For vpon the not yeelding of some secular Priestes, to subiect themselues, first to the Iesuites in direct termes, and the not admitting of an authoritie procured by them afterward, for their indirect soueraintie, this present controuersie began, and being once ended, at the sight of a *Breue*, it was renewed againe by the rashnesse of the Iesuites, and the indiscretion of the Archpriest, as it is prooued at large in the bookes set out by the Secular priests, and promulgated in the latter *Breue*, dated the 17. of *August*. 1601. as shall hereafter be shewed. I affirme the rest to be false, because so it shalbe proued, for so much as is touched thereof, either in the *Apologie*, or in this *Epistle*. Omitting therefore, what is here propounded to his Holinesse, concerning the Catholikes their going to the Protestants Churches, at the beginning of her Maiesties raign, who now is: (a thing which would not haue bene published to the world by any, who tendered their honour, vnlesse there had bene some greater cause for it) the subornation of some by the Counsell to poyson D. *Allen* (afterwardes Cardinall) and the Students, & raising of sedition among the Catholikes beyond the Sea, the euill successe, which some had about the Queene of Scots, and diuers Gentlemen (which is here attributed to their secret keeping of their practises from *Fa. Parsons*, and other) the inducing of two Priests, to write two bookes in fauour of heretikes, as it were by reason of State, and to become spies, the one in France, the other in Spaine.

Lastly to let passe, that which is here said, that *Car. Allen* perceiued, that there was a faction begun in England by the same acte (of the Counsell) against the *Fathers* of the *Societie*, and writ most earnestly against it, & that *Card. Sega* had found out, that a few vnquiet spirits were set on craftily, by the subtile instruments of the Counsel, & were the cause of many troubles in that Colledge at Rome, we wil here only touch such points, as do concerne our selues, and the matter now in controuersie. *Your Holines* therefore (saith this Author) *seeing prudently these causes*



*causes and effects, and hauing put a finall end to the long, and fastidious troubles of the English Romane Colledge, & giuen your straight commandement by words of mouth, to such persons of the tumultuous, as departed into England in that yeere 1597, to be quiet for the time to come, & to haue peace with all, but namely with the Fathers of the Societie, and hearing notwithstanding the next yeere after, by diuers letters out of England, that this was not obserued, but new meanes rather deuised of further diuision, and sedition; your Holines did vpon these considerations, and vpon the letters, and requests of diuers of the grauest Priests of our nation, which after we shall cite, ordaine by the Card. Protector his letters an easie, and sweet subordination, &c. If wee had no other prooue of this fellowes falsehood, then might be made apparant in this second point of the Epistle, it would giue euery honest man sufficient satisfaction. His Holines is here put in minde of such strange matters, and his wisdom very highly commended vpon so false grounds, as if this Epistle had bene euer deliuered vnto him, hee would speedily haue discovered a notable sycophancy. He is here told of two principall motiues, for his ordaining our easie, and sweet subordination. The one were certaine letters, which signified, that betweene the tumultuous who departed into England in the yeere 1597, and the Fathers of the Societie, there was not that peace, which he had commanded, but new meanes rather deuised of further diuision, and sedition. The other were other letters and requests of diuers of the grauest priests of our nation, which after (saith he) wee shall cite. Concerning the first, least there should be any error in Iudgement, what those new meanes of further diuision should be, there is this note in the margent, *The new association; which conceite is deliuered in plainer termes, and more at large in the first Chapter of the Apol. fol. 6. in this maner, But the reliques of those, that had bene troublesome, and vquiet before their comming into England, and conferring againe with their consorts of their former actions, and designments, frustrated (as they thought) by F. Parson's dealing at Rome, resolved to begin againe, but after another fashion, To wit, by deuising a certaine new Association among themselues, &c. And in the 2. Chapter fol. 13. his Holines hearing of certaine new Associations begun in England soone after the tumults ended in Rome, &c. These (to**

F

omit



omit other places in the *Apologie*) are sufficient to shew, that his intention is, to make the Pope beleue, that the *Association* which was begun in England by the Secular priests, was a new deuise of those, who were sent from Rome in the yeere 1597, as *tumultuous*, and vnquiet persons. That this is a meere deluding of his Holines, all who were then in England can very well testifie: yea *F. Parsons* himselfe will doe vs the fauour (I am sure) to say this is a very false tale, who vnderstood at his first coming to Rome by *M. James Standish*, that such an *Association* had bene long before intended, and consequently could not bee a deuice of such, as thought themselues frustrated of their designments, by his dealing in Rome.

The 6. assistants in their letters of the 2. of May 1601. doe testifie, that this *association* began foure or five yeres since, *Cap. 7. Apol. fol. 90.* and that must needs be before those priests came into England, on whom it is fathered, if it be true, which is sayd *Cap. 2. Apol. fol. 12.* that they were not gone from Rome at the beginning of September 1597. It may also be gathered out of the same Chapter *fol. 89.* that this *association* very probably was begun long before by others: for there we finde this storie. But (*M. Mush*) returning into England, as he went forth, and the Cardinall soone after dying (in the yeere 1594. as appeareth *Cap. 1. Apol fol 6.*) hee ioyned with another of his owne humour &c. And they two, with some few other, determined to make a certaine new Hierarchy of their owne, calling it an association of Clergie men &c. The truth is, that *M. Mush*, and *M. Dudley* hauing made the peace at *Wisbich* in the yeere 1595. (as appeareth *Ca. 6. Apol fol. 79.*) returned to London, and there dealt with *M. James Standish*, a man growing in deed into that humor (to wit of being a Iesuit, which *M. Mush* was then leauing) and not with *M. Colington* (as is here falsly noted in the margent, for about that time *M. Collington* lay very little at, or neere London) and they, and some others thought it very fit, that there should be an *association* of such priests as would liue vnder rule, to take away that slander, which the Iesuits, & their fauourites (to further their ambitious attempts) had generally spread abroad against the priests, to wit, that they liued not vnder rule. And thus much concerning this first falshood, and the deluding his Holinesse



Holineſſe with this tale, that the *affociation* was a new deuife of ſuch as were in thoſe broiles at Rome, and would not remaine in that peace which was commended vnto them, and commanded by his Holines in the yere 1597.

The ſecond falſhood is more deceitfully (although as groſſy) conueyed, in putting his Holines in mind, what was his ſecond motiue, in the ordaining our *eaſie and ſweete Subordination*: forſooth, *the letters and requests of diuers of the graueſt prieſts of our nation, which after we ſhal cite*. And becauſe he wil ſeem to deale faithfully in this cauſe, he putteth this note in the margent, Ca. 9 10. *Apol.* by which his Hol. is giuen to vnderſtand, that thoſe letters and requests of the graueſt prieſts, by which he was induced to make this ſubordination, are to be found in the ninth and tenth Chapt. of the *Apol.* But now what if there be not any letters, or requests in the ninth or tenth Chapt. concerning any ſuch matter, what a ſhameleſſe fellow is this informer? In the ninth chapter *fol. 125.* begin certain letters of ſome prieſts, and others follow: but theſe are not, neither can be the motiues of his Holineſſe to make this *Subordination*: they are written particularly againſt *M.D. Biſhop*, and *M. Charnock*: becauſe they preſumed to goe to his Holines about this *Subordination*, already made as it was: And this is euident to thoſe, who will vouchſafe to turne vnto the chapters. In the tenth chapter there is leſſe matter, if leſſe may be, for this purpoſe; that I cannot but marueile how this fellow durſt tell his Holines ſuch a lewd tale: But perchance this good fellow had this policie: he ſet in the margent *the 9 and 10. chapters*, hoping that his Holines, if he ſhould chance to cauſe them to be turned into *Latin*, would be ſo tired with ſeeking in the ninth, as he would rather beleeue, they were in the 10. chapt. then be ſo troubled againe: perchance this marginall note was ſet but in the Engliſh Copie, where it would ſerue well enough for thoſe, which haue ſuch a facilitie in beleeuing ſuch like felowes as this is, as they will runne ryot with them, howſoeuer their conſcience diſclaime it. Perchance it was miſtaken, and this *9. and 10. chapters* were put in the margent in ſtead of the *eighth*. And this we are induced to beleeue the rather, becauſe at the beginning of the eighth chap. this very matter is handled, and ſome letters



cited: and for the better satisfaction of the reader, I will here set downe the place at large, to which (as I suppose) this fellow alludeth, and had rather his Reader should misse the place then hit it, because retaining a confused remembrance of such matters he should runne away with it, without further examination of the trueth, or the likelyhood thereof. These are the words in the *Apology*, cap. 8. fol. 98. *When his Holinesse heard the former state of the matters in England, Flanders, and other places, and of the murmurations of some against the Fathers of the Societie, set down as well in the foresaid contumelious Memoriall, as by diuers other letters and relations which came to the Protectors sight, and by him was related to his Holines, and namely when he receiued great store of priuate and publike letters out of England against the sayd Memoriall of Fisher, and some one with aboue an 100. hands at it, other with 40, and 50, all in fauour and commendation of the Fathers their labours, and behauiour in England, against the sayd slanderous Memoriall, and many other in seuerall letters of principall men, which are yet extant: when also diuers of these did expressly demaund some Subordination and gouernement of Secular priests, to take away this emulation of some few against the Fathers, and that two lately came out of England at that very time: one a Iesuite, the other a secular priest, each of them vrging the same in the behalfe both of the one, and the other order; his Holinesse after mature deliberation resolved to yeelde thereunto, hoping thereby to quiet all, &c. And so he goeth forward, and sheweth how it was consulted vpon, and of whom opinions were asked, to wit, of F. Parsons, F. Baldwin, who was one of the two, which lately came out of England, as appeareth by the marginall note in that place, M. Doctor Haddock, M. Martin Array, M. James Standish, who was the other which came out of England, as appeareth by the same marginall note, although falsly sayd to bee a secular priest, hauing giuen his name long before to become a Iesuite, and gaue it out here in England, that his going ouer was to enter into their order, & others that had laboured in the English vineyard, perchance Fa. Warford, another Iesuit, & such like: but these matters we shall handle there in that place. Here onely we haue noted this relation out of the 8. chap. to help the fauourers of this *Apologie*, that they wander*

not:



not through the woods to no purpose, if they follow not the path which their author sheweth the, and so bring them where they may find somewhat, (although not that which they looke for) after a long seeking, where there is nothing at all of this matter. And if this be not the place, which is meant in this Epistle, there is none in all the *Apologie*. For this quotation in the margent *fol. 101.* in the same chapt. *See the letter of 6. ancient priests, the 13. of September 1597.* is a poore prooffe, and to say the trueth it would bee more for the others credit, if there were none at all cited in the *Apologie*. For if any man will be so indifferent in this case, as but to looke vnto the dates of the letters here cited in the beginning of the eighth chapter in the *Apologie*, (which by the Contents seemeth to bee the place, which must iustifie as much, as is suggested in this Epistle) and conferre them with the date of Cardinal *Caietane* his letter, by which this Subordination was appointed in England, he shall finde that they were all written after the Cardinals letters, some longer, some lesse while, and consequently after his Holines his determination, to make this *Subordination*, and therefore could not be any motiue thereof. The letter of the Card. *Caietane* by which the *Subordination* was appointed in England, beareth date the 7. of *March 1598*, as appeareth in that 8 chapter, *fol. 102.* And the letters by which his Holines is sayd to haue been mooued to make this *Subordination* in England, and are cited in this 8. chapter, *fol. 98*, beare date, some the 27 of *March*, some the 20 of *Aprill*, some the 18 of *May*, some the 30 of *Iuly*, the soonest the foure and twentieth of *March 1598*: all which must needes argue not onely an egregious falshood in this Epistle-maker, but a notorious impudencie, in telling his Holinesse to his teeth, that hee did make an *ease and sweete Subordination* vpon the letters, and requests, which he had neuer heard of, nor possibly could, they not hauing been written or thought vpon by the Inditors, long after his Holinesse is sayd to haue thought vpon the *Subordination*, and caused it to be made by the Card *Caietane*. And as for the note in the margent, *fol. 101.* it is not probable that a letter of that moment would not haue been set in the booke much sooner then any other.



With the like libertie this Epistle is continued: His Holines is told, that *all good and obedient Catholicks were much contented and comforted with this subordination*: which is a most inui-rious insinuation against many, who (to make no odious comparisons) haue shewed themselues in all points, as hath become the best, & most obedient Catholicks. Neither are there any *letters* at all in the 9. Chap. of the *Apol.* of this *thanksgiu-ing*, as the Pope is here told, and those which are in the 8. cha. are not from any of the Laitie, but from some priests, all whose names are for some causes omitted in this *Apol.* except the first subscriber, & the last, which perchance was therefore thought necessary to be set downe, to proue that at the least there were two to a letter: and that the middle names might bee as many in number, as are here supposed. But it was a marueilous good chance, that the first subscriber, and the last were such, as their names might be knowen. But perchance, vnder the name of all good, and obedient Catholicks, the English Clergie is also to be vnderstood, of which a few (saith this *Epistle-maker*) *not the twentieth part, and those for the most part such, as had bene troublesome before in Rome, presumed to impugne the same subordination, calling first in question the said Cardinals letters, &c.* Fa. Parsons was told in Rome, that doublessc the greater part of the priests was not contented with this *subordination*, & when for his purpose he vrged further, *how many the messengers did certainly know, to approue their mission* (as appeareth Cap. 9. fol. 131.) they (not being willing to depose for more in this kinde, then they had either spoken withall, or receiued letters from them to this effect) answered accordingly that they *had certaine knowledge of some 14. or 15,* which number is now deceitfully tossed vp, and downe, as though they had no knowledge of any more, or did come in the name of so few against all the rest; yet where there was iust cause if they had bene fewer, yea if there had bene no more but those two, who went to Rome, they had ben enough, because iustice hath alwayes more with it, then against it. But to this purpose, if those 14. or 15, which were named by M. *Char-nock* in his examination, were here set downe, the falshood of this fellow would be euident to those who know the men, when he suggesteth to his Hol. that they were for the most part such,

as



as had bene troublesome before in Rome. Concerning the calling this *subordination* in question, how it was procured, how far forth it did binde, before the *Breue* came, and other difficulties which the priests had, they haue not desired to haue them muttered in corners, as may appeare by their bookes: to which their aduersaries silence would haue beene somewhat more for their credit, then their shuffling answere. And as for the euill successe, which their two messengers had, whome at the first they sent to Rome, all the world knoweth, that not long after his Holines comming thither, they were infamously apprehended by Iesuits and *Sbirri*, all their writings were taken from them, they were kept asunder in close prison, and were not suffered to speake with any to aske counsell, nor to see the Copie of such accusations as were put vp against them, at such time as they did demand it, to make their answere before the two Cardinals, *Caietane* and *Burghesius* 17. Feb. 1599. and yet they were kept afterwards close prisoners vntill the 8. of April, by which time all matters were concluded as their aduersaries would, as appeareth by the date of the *Breue* which was the 6. of April 1599.

The notorious falshood also which here is suggested to his Holinesse in these words, *Who* (that is the two Priests) *finding not such successe \* there, as they required, their fellowes in England* \* At Rome. *for remedie, began to deale more closely with the Counsell, telling them (as hath appeared since by the euent, and by their latter bookes) that this subordination was not for Religion, but for State practises, as in this Apologie is declared more particularly:* And in the margin is set this note, *Apol. cap. 10. 12. 13.* But whosoever wil examine the tenth Chapter, he shall find a few idle, and doubtfully proposed assertions, or rather foolish coniectures, which are in as great neede to be proued, as this is here. In the twelfth Chapter there is not one word, wise, or other to this purpose. In the thirteenth Chapter, there is some prooffe brought for that, which is here proposed to his Holinesse. But the prooffe is such, as it would haue made a man of little modestie to haue blushed with the very conceite thereof. Marke I pray you, what a narration there is, fol. 209. For this is it, which is ment, as may appeare by this marginall note, *D. Bagshaw. But aboue all*



*all other meanes the fowleſt is, and ought moſt to mooue a good conſcience, their ioyning ſecretly for a time, but after, more openly: and now, moſt evidently with the common enemy, and perſecuter. Firſt (as before you haue heard) as ſoone as euer they vnderſtood, that their two meſſengers were reſtrained in Rome, and not like to preuaile, then D. Bagshaw was ſent for from Wiſbich to London, to treat with the Councell, &c. The Pope iſtolde in this Epistle, that the Priests deale cloſely with the Councell: but in the Apologie, the Catholikes are told, that it hath bene ſecretly for a time, but after, more openly, and now, moſt evidently. The Priests haue alwayes bene readie to giue an account, in what, and how farre, they haue vſed that fauour, which her Maieſtie, and the honorable Councell are ſaid to haue ſhewen vnto them: and all men are to thinke, that they would not haue gone to Rome, if they had done any thing, which Catholike prieſtes might not doe. But marke, I pray you, the ſubſtantiall prooſe to which his Holineſſe is referred: and let it be duely examined: As ſoone as euer they vnderſtood, that their two meſſengers were reſtrained in Rome, and not like to preuaile, then D. Bagshaw was ſent for from Wiſbich to London, to treat with the Councell, &c. If we looke into the Apologie, we ſhall finde, that the two meſſengers came to Rome vpon the xj. of December 1598. cap. 9. fol. 121. and they were imprifoned vpon the 29. of the ſame moneth. And M. D. Bagshaw his ſending for was not ſo ſecretly done, but that all England may quickly vnderſtand, that he was long before this time at London, and that hee was either returned againe to Wiſbich, or vpon his returning, before it was knowne in England, that the two Priests were reſtrained in Rome. And yet his Holineſſe muſt needes be tolde, that vpon their reſtraint in December, and by reaſon thereof, D. Bagshaw was ſent for from Wiſbich, to treat with the Councell, in the moneth of October. Can any thing make this fellowe bluſh, who is ſo generally careleſſe, what he publiſheth to the world? or can the Cath. expect, that hee ſhould deale more faithfully with them for their inſtruction, who will ſo boldly abuſe his Holineſſe?*

*All that alſo which followeth in the 13. point, touched in this Epistle to his Holineſſe, conſiſteth vpon diuers vntrueths ſhuffled in one vpon another: as firſt, that the two Cardinals, Caietane*



Caietane and Burgheſius, did duely examine all matters. Secondly, that the Priests did but make a ſhew to obey the Breue (as hauing engaged themſelues before with the Conncell to the contrary) and thereupon ſought occasions to breake againe. Thirdly, that they ſent not any to proſecute their appeale. Fourthly, that they did not expect his Holines ſentence or definition, but proceeded by ſecret fauour, and intelligence with the Councel, and Biſh. of London, to print and ſet forth erroneous libels to the detraction of diuers venerable men, and of a whole order of Religion, and of their immediate ſuperiours, and of the ſea of Rome it ſelfe, of his Holineſſe, and the Proteſtors proceeding in this matter. To the firſt it is answered, that all matters were not duely examined, when the two Priests were not ſuffered to deale, neither as plaintifes, nor as defendants, beeing clapped vp cloſe priſoners, all their inſtructions taken away from them, not ſuffered to ſpeake one with another, or to conferre with any man elſe about thoſe matters, for which they came: examined by F. Parsons, who made ſuch Interrogatories as were for his purpoſe, being the principall aduerſarie on the other part, and curtailed their anſweres when it pleaſed him, or blotted out both Interrogatories and anſweres when they ſucceeded not to his mind: being brought before the two Cardinals, Caietane and Burgheſius, where after they had heard ſeuerally ſome part of their examinations read, they were admitted to come together to heare a libel read ioyntly againſt them both, but were not ſuffered to haue the copie thereof, to make their anſwere thereunto, as they deſired: and beeing friendly diſmiſſed for that inſtant, were afterwards kept cloſe priſoners ſeuene weekes longer, and not ſuffered to come together, vntill the Breue was out in confirmation of the authority. And thus much for the *due examination of all matters*, which is here ſuggeſted to his Holines. To the ſecond it is answered, That the Priests made an vnfeined peace for their parts, and ſought diuers wayes to haue all ſuch queſtions ended, as might be cauſe of contention betweene them, as may appeare both by their offer of diſputation, and their ſending to Paris for their further reſolution, and ſatisfaction of their ghosly children, after their offer of diſputation was reieſted by the Archpriest. It is alſo well knowne, that the Counſell was not ſo enformed at that



time of the difference betweene such men, as they tooke to be dangerous to the State, and others, neither had any priests as then more fauor then the other had. And where it is said here, that *the Priests sought occasions to breake againe*, it is most vnttrue: the contention was renued by the Iesuits, who after the peace was cōcluded, gaue their censure, that those Priests were *schismatikes*, who had deferred to subiect themselues to the new authority before they saw the *Breue*. And this contention was encreased through the default of the Archpr. who being certified of the Iesuits rashnes in their speeches concerning this point, did shew himselfe to be of the same opinion: and furthermore gaue direction, that the priests should make account of their being *schismatikes*, and satisfie, before they should receiue the benefit of absolution, as appeareth by the *resolution* diuulged by him from the *mother citie*. Of all which, the *Breue* dated the 17. *August. 1601.* taketh notice. And in the relation thereof, his Holines vseth these wordes: *Quod dolentes referimus*, that is to say, *which with grieve we relate*. And therefore it must be great want of shame, to tell his Holines in this *Epistle*, that *the Priests either made a shew to obey, or sought occasions to breake againe*. And this testimony out of the *Breue* is of the more force, if it be true which is said in the *Preface* to the *Appendix*, that his Holinesse had not vnderstood of any of these *scandalous bookes* (for so it pleaseth this author to terme the bookes which the Priests set out) when he wrote the *Breue*, and therefore could not receiue any such information by them, as he doth follow in the *Breue*.

The third matter is now answered by the Priests, therepresent in Rome.

To the fourth it is answered, that notwithstanding the Appeale, the Archpriest proceeded against the Appellants, and principally because they had appealed; as may appeare by many acts which he did: and for this in particular, there is yet his owne hand to shew, to a lay gentleman of the 16. of *April 1601.* *This I write vnto you, to make you priuie of the great spirituall danger, wherein you, and all that receiue any sacrament of M. Ofw. Needam, may be, if it be so, that hee hath subscribed to a seditious pamphlet, coloured with the name of an Appeale.* And in respect that the Archpriest did in this maner proceed against the Appellants,



pellants, without *expecting his Hol. sentence and definition*, which they might haue procured, notwithstanding his most irreuerent refutaries, the Appellants proceeded to publish their cause in print without *detractiō*, or defamation, more then is requisite for the following of the cause in question. And whereas it is here said, that *a whole religion is defamed*, it is most vntrue: as appeareth by the booke to the *Inquisition*, pag. 5. *the Sea of Rome* is no way dishonoured, but rather maintained, and all lawfull superioritie: neither were these bookes printed *by secret fauour and intelligence with the Councel and Bishop of London*: For which this only argument might satisfie an indifferent man, that they would haue had a moreskilfull man to haue printed them, and not to haue one to worke, who (as the *Latine* booke doth very well shew) did not vnderstand one word in *Latine*.

His exceptions against certaine propositions, as *scandalous*, and *temerarious*, leaue some doubt in a man of iudgment, whether this fellow be more ignorant or more malicious. He referreth his Holines to the 2. and 11. Chap. of the *Apol.* where hee doeth too-much discredit himselfe, as shalbe there shewed. But lest the Reader should conceiue, according to the broadnesse of these termes, we will here only note the propositions, which he termeth *scandalous*, and *temerarious*, and so leaue them, vntill their place come to be defended. *Authoritie is not an infallible rule of trueth in all, who haue authoritie. No man is bound in all things to beleue or execute, what euery man in authoritie ouer him shall put vpon him. Archpriests, and their superiors also the Archdeacons, and other of higher degree haue done amisse, and swarued from the trueth; and who vpon earth is warranted from erring, but one, and not he in all things.* These propositions are put in the second Chapter of the *Apol.* fol. 16. and in the margent, there is this note: *Dangerous, and offensiue doctrine.* And in the same Chap. fol. 19. there is exception taken at this proposition, *The sacrament of Cōfirmation is either most necessary in time of persecution, or altogether vaine, and as a superfluous ceremony in Gods Church.* And in the margent there is this note set, *A very temerarious proposition*: and he proueth it, because it is not absolutely necessary to saluation. If this fellow had euer bene a Souldier, he would haue conceiued the necessitie perchance, of Armor,



and weapons in warres, although no man will say, that armor, or weapons are *absolutely necessary* to the getting of a kingdom. In the 11. Chapter here quoted, there is nothing but a certaine remembrance of this point, with a reference to the 2. Chapter, where what is said, shalbe discuffed, and answered with lesse danger of the *Inquisition*, then this good fellow is in. And whereas here also it is said, that *by the Priests their owne letters it may be proued, that they haue dealt expressely with the Queene and Counsell against the Fathers of the Societie, and such as stand with them*: It is a false bragge, and wil be taken for such, vnlesse some other letter be forged, then that which is cited in the 13. Chap. For this doeth not proue any such matter, as any man may see. These are the words in that letter fol. 210, *I haue in some sort pacified the wrath of our Prince, conceiued against vs, and of her Counsell, and haue layed the fault, where it ought to be, and proued that the Secular priests are innocent for the most part.* Which words cannot import, that he, who writ this letter, had dealt against any, but onely that he had dealt for some, who were before thought to be as deepe in matters displeasing to the State, as others: the State being before out of doubt, that there were such plots, as were not besecming subiects, & much lesse besecming men of our calling, and so much the more odious, by how much the shew of piety is dangerous, for the effecting of any stratageme; And the Counsell thought, that all had bene of one stampe: wherein the Inditer of that letter affirmeth, he hath otherwise enformed them, and freed the innocent. Now we wil see, how this Author beginneth to close vp his Holines mouth with as notorious a falshood, as any of the rest.

*They haue obteyned (saith he) that foure of their seditious company, that were in prison before, haue libertie vnder the Queenes letters patents, to ride vp and downe all England for a time, to gather money, and letters, which few Cath. will dare to deny them, least they detect them to the Councell, &c.* This also is a meditation vpon the same letter, which is before cited, and is to be found in the 13. Chap. of the *Apol.* fol. 210. wherein are these words: *I haue (by opening the case vnto their Honours and to Caesar) obteyned that foure principall men shalbe banished after a sort, to follow the appeale, D. Bagshaw, Bluet, Champney, & Barneley, all prisoners: they shall*



*shall be here with me on Wednesday next. A moneth they shall haue within the Realme, to ride abroad for money amongst their friends, and then chuse their port, &c. And from hence perchance this fellow had some part of his intelligence: but how commeth he to inlarge himselfe so farre, as to say, that these Priests had her Maiesties letters Patents? vpon what record hath he found this? or doth he meane thereby to draw the Lord Keeper into question, as though he stood now in his light for some what, which he hath to effect, (all Letters patents being at his perill vpon record?) or doth he know any Cath. who in such quandaries did giue these Priests any money? we knowe some, who, notwithstanding the great bond they had to some of them, would not see them, neither would the priests presse vpon them. Some againe we know, who were requested to giue somewhat to their iourney to Rome, if not for loue of the men, yet for the loue which they pretended to peace, and to haue a final end of the controuersie, which could not be had but at Rome: and nothing would be giuen. But this fellow careth not, what he saith to the Pope, presuming perchance, that by some way or other, all accesse should be shut, and his falshood should neuer bee discovered. And thus forgetting that which hee saith in the Apologie cap. 11. fol. 162. that the intention of the Priests seemeth not to be, to informe his Holinesse, but to make a noise in England, and to gaine time of libertie, and to preoccupate some mens minds, by making a shew, that they appeale to the highest in this their controuersie, but yet indeed would be loth that hee should know it, and much lother to answere it before him, especially this Pope, &c. Here he telleth the Pope in this Epistle, that the Priests are to passe into France, and there, by the helpe of the Queenes Ambassadors, and other meanes, to procure (if they can) his most Christian Maiesties letters to your Holines in their fauor, pretending that they can get the Queene of England to giue libertie of conscience, to some Catholicke, vnder certaine conditions, whereof some must bee, that the Iesuits must goe forth of England. All this is in handling (most holy Father) by the children of iniquitie, against Gods cause, and his seruants, and will no doubt, bring forth lamentable effects, if your Holines doe not speedily put your hand thereunto. In this Apologie we do lay downe, by cleare historicall narration, and authentick*



*testimonies, the grounds of all. Christ our Saviour inspire your Holines, &c.* In the 10. Chap. of the *Apol. fol. 147.* there is a prayer made to God, by the Archpr. *to giue him his grace, so to vse Fa. Parsons benefits, as that neuer he abuse them, and that neuer hee fall into any ingratefull behauiour, &c.* And in the margent there is this note, *A prophetic of the Archpriest to Fa. Parsons.* How much more worthily doeth this place in the *Epistle* deserue to be noted for a *prophetic*? but perchance hee was loath, that there should be any such *prophetic*, as that any good, or ease should come to the Catholicks, by the absence of the Iesuits in England. Wotterh he not, that his Holines knoweth, that no euill is to be done, although good should ensue thereon? If it be a sinfull act, to call the Iesuits out of England, what feare is there, that his Holines would doe it? If it be no sinfull acte, to call them out of England: and that thereupon may come ease, and quiet to the Church, which hath bene a long time in the more grievous persecution, in regard of the hard opinion, which our Prince, and Counsell haue had of their statizing, vnder a colour of pietie, and Religion: how farre are these fellows from that Spirit of *Ionas*, who willingly yeelded himselfe rather to be thrown out of the ship into the sea, then that through his default those, who were in it, should perish? But of these matters we shall haue cause elsewhere, to delate more at large. And in the meane while wee make humble request to the indifferent Readers, to note well throughout the *Apologie* how farre this Author is from all Authentick testimonies, in laying downe the grounds of all such matters, as are now in question: for we are not here to stand vpon such impertinent stufte, as he thrusteth into his booke, to the end, that by shuffling in sometime some part of our matters, he might make them odious to such, as will runne ouer his packes without searching into them, what is therein belonging to our controuersie, and how little coherence it hath with that other, with which it is ioyned.



C H A P. 5.

*How the Apologie-maker by the same reason which he giueth for the publishing of his Apologie, doth giue light to his reader to conceiue the iust cause which the Priests had to print their bookes.*

**T**He Preface of this *Apologie* is to the Catholikes of England to fore-arme, & forewarne them, what is meant thereby, lest the matter being otherwise taken, then it ought to be, should yeeld to scandall, and thereby overthrow (sayth he) and worke your ruine which is intended, and permitted by Almighty God, Father of all mercies to your triall, and greater merit, &c. But this fore-arming of the Catholiks is such, as they ought all to be forewarned, what is meant by this his fore-arming. For what Catholike, or worthy seruant of God (as he tearmeth them) hath euer before this time beleeued, that either scandall, or their ruine hath been intended, howsoeuer it hath been permitted by Almighty God vpon some cause best knowen vnto his diuine Maiestie? For how farre off is this fore-arming, or forewarning from his doctrine, who sayth, that the betraying of Christ was Gods acte in Iudas, as well as repentance in S. Peter? But I pray you see how he goeth on, affirming that Christ sent aduersaries to afflict his Church: and which is most ridiculous, he auoucheth that he sent a new kind of aduersaries neuer heard of in the world before, named heretikes, that tooke vnto themselves the name of the best sort of Christians &c. If there were no heretikes before, what were the Pharises, and Sadduces? Of whom Ioseph lib. 18. *Antiqui. Iud. cap. 2.* affirmeth, that the Pharises held opinion that those soules, who after the separation from the body were found good, did retorne againe to some other bodies. And that the Sadduces did thinke that the soule died with the body. And doubtlesse this was the cause, why it is so precisely recorded in the second booke of the *Macchabees cap. 12.* that Iudas did thinke piously, and religiously of the resurrection? For about this time did these people rise, and fell very quickly into these heresies, perchance the sooner for their  
very



very great pride, which they tooke of their ouer selfe-weening religious course of life. Of the *Saduces* we haue many testimonies in the new Testament, and of their error, as Math. 22. Mar. 12. Luk 20. and Act 23. but two notable places there are in the Acts of the Apostles, which shew not onely, that these were errors, but *heresies*, and that they were *Heretikes*, who are related by the Euangelist, to haue assaulted our Sauour. We reade in the 5. chapter a company thus described: *Quæst heresis Saduceorum*, which is the heresie of the *Saduces*. And in the 24. chapter: *Tertullus* the oratour accuseth *S. Paul* before *Fælix* the President in this manner, *Inuenimus, &c. We found this pestiferous fellow both raising contention against all the Iewes in the world, and broaching the sedition of the sect of those of Nazareth.* And for that word *sect* there is in the Greeke copie *τῆς αἰρέσεως*, *heresie*. And in the same chap. *S. Paul* answering for himselfe acknowledgeth, that *he serued God in that way, which his accusers called heresie.* Can there be any plainer Testimonies, that there were *heresies* among the Iewes, and so accounted by them, and the men accused thereof, who held such opinions? But this good fellow writeth to such, as hee thinketh will not bee euill conceited of him, howsoeuer he abuseth them, or himselfe, but will rather take his wordes for oracles, how contrary soeuer they are to trueth. Hereupon also he emboldeneth himselfe to cast many doubts, and suspitions into his readers head, against the priests whom he calleth *Libellers*. First because (as he sayth) *There is no certaine author of their bookes named.* Secondly, because *no licence of superiors for printing is named.* Thirdly, because *worthy men are defamed by name without intention, or possibility to proue it by lawful meanes.* To the first I answered, that the authors names are as leageably set downe in the bookes, which the priests set out, as the authors names of this Apologie. That booke which is dedicated to his Holinesse is set out by the priests vnder their owne names, as appeareth by the title of the booke, where it is sayd to be giuen to his Hol. *by the priests who were most vniustly defamed of schisme and other crimes.* And in the appeale their names are particularly set downe who they are, Pag. 119. and the other are set out in the same maner. And this *Apologie* is sayd to be written, and set forth by priests united in due subordination



*nation to the Archpr.* but the reader must go looke, who they are. This exception therefore against the priests bookes is very absurd, and proueth that the *Apologie* commeth neerer to the nature of a *Libel*, then the Priests books. To the second I answer, that in case the *Superiour* be a party & laboureth what he may with all men, that the trueth of the question be not knowen, and to that end forbiddeth, that any thing be written, or read, which may giue satisfaction to indifferent men, it is not necessary to expect his licence, neither is it a note of a *Libel* to print without it.

To the third I answer, that there is no man touched in these bookes, but for such matters, and vpon such ground, as the authors of them are ready to iustifie, and haue already shewed, that they haue intention to proue them. In which this *Apologie* sayling, as it must needs doe, the author hath already giuen iudgement against himselfe, that he is a notorious *libeller*, and that he hath brought all his followers, and furtherers herein, (whether consenters, or spreaders of it abroad) into a heauie case, God amend them. But let vs, I pray you, examine the cause, why this *Apologie* was written: (the authour thereof blaming so often the Priests for writing) *Diuers points* (saith he) *you know already, and some more you are like to perceiue by this our Apologie (being driuen thereunto) but not all, for auoiding further scandall: which respect of scandall should haue withheld vs wholly from putting pen to paper in this cause, if the intemperance of some persons (giuen ouer as it seemeth to choler and reuenge, and forgetting both themselues and others, and the times wherein they liue) had not broken forth of late to such excesse, as we are forced against our wils, to put some stop, or bridle to so licentious and scandalous proceedings, lest it infect euen the good, and trouble the strongest, when they see such enormous matters passe without controlement.* In this iustification of his setting forth this *Apologie* we gather, first that scandall is not alwayes to be auoyded: For as he saith: *The respect of scandal should haue withheld him wholly from putting pen to paper in this case, if the intemperance, &c.* so that the intemperance belike of some persons may excuse a man doing that, whereupon scandall may arise. Note I pray you, how this fellow can change his hew, when it shall make for his purpose.



1. Corinth. 8.

Matth. 18.

pose. When hee will write himselfe, then *the intemperance of some persons* is a sufficient excuse for him, although scandall arise thereon. And when he would haue others blamed, who were more grieuously iniured, and prouoked thereby to write then he is: he can preach vnto them, that S. Paul was of a spirit and iudgement contrary to theirs, *who doth so greatly exaggerate the danger of scandalizing any one of our brethren for whom Christ died (as he sayd) that he would rather neuer eate meate, then doe it.* Thus saith this *Apologie-maker* in his *Appendix, fol. 16.* And there he goeth on also, and sheweth what Christ himselfe said: *That it were better suffer death in most hideous manner (to wit, with a milstone at our neckes to be cast into the sea) then to scandalize the least of them, that beleue in him, that be our Christian and Catholike brethren.* And then he concludeth in this maner: *So as this other diuinitie, that it may be done for sauing of our credites, mainteining our good names, and other commodities, was not then known, and commeth now downe from a contrary spirit, and Master, to Christ and S. Paul.*

Matth. 16.

Matth. 15.

By this then it followeth, that howsoeuer the Priests can auoid blame, this *Apologie-maker* is in the lurch, who (hauing so great skill, not onely in the sayings of S. Paul, but of Christ also, and in diuinity, and the true meaning of it) notwithstanding he thought that some scandall would growe by this his acte, aduentured contrary to true diuinitie to write this *Apologie*. The diuinitie which the priests doe professe, teacheth them that the scandall of little ones is to be auoided: and the scandall of *Pharises* is to be contemned. And as they reade in one place: *Qui scandalizauerit &c. Whosoever shall scandalize one of these little ones, which beleue in mee, it were better for him that he had a milstone hung about his necke, and he drowned in the bottome of the sea.* So in another place they finde, that Christ (when his disciples told him that the *Pharises* were scandalized at that which he said) answered, *Sinite illos, &c. Let them alone, they are blind, and guiders of the blind.* There are diuers reasons set forth by the Priests, to iustifie their publishing of their bookes: but to an indifferent Reader this place of the *Preface* is warrant inough, since that in this authors opinion, there needeth no other cause, then to put some stop or bridle to so licentious  
and



*and scandalous proceedings, least it infect, even the good, and trouble the strongest, when they see such enormous matters passe, without controulment. Was there euer any so licentious and scandalous proceedings, as haue beene against the Priestes? Can Fa. Listers, the Iesuites treatize of Schisme be matched for excesse, and passion against Catholike priests? was there euer such an outrage committed in Christendome by any Catholike to another, as this is, Harken, O ye factious, ye are Rebels, yee are Schismatikes, and fallen out of the Church, and spouse of Christ, yee haue troden vnder your feete the obedience which yee owe to the highest Bishop: yee haue sinned against all humane faith and authoritie, by reiecting a moral certainty in a morall matter: yee haue violently run into excommunication, & irregularitie: ye haue lost your faculties, by which you should haue gained soules to Christ: ye haue so scandalized all the godly, as now yee are generally become infamous? What shall I say more? ye haue sinned against Christ his chiefe Vicar, and Christ himselfe the Iudge and Iusticer, by your disobedience, that with Samuel the Prophet we may say: Quasi peccatum, &c. as a thing of south-saying it is, to repugne; and as the offence of Idolatry, not to be willing to be quiet. See I pray you, that ye are nothing better then South-sayers and Idolaters. And because yee haue not heard the Church, while she spake vnto you by the chiefeest Bishop, yee are as Ethnicks and Publicans. And here I make an end, earnestly desiring the very mightie God, that he will yet at the last giue you his grace, lest that being thrust into sempiternall destruction with Ethnicks and Idolaters you suffer immortall paines for this your disobedience and scandall. Thus farre F. Lister the Iesuite. And was it not necessary, that there should be some stop put, or bridle to this licentious and scandalous proceeding? was there not danger that the good might hereby be infected? nay is it not euident, that many a good soule hath bene infected, and many also of the strongest troubled hereby? and had not then the Priests iust cause to declare vnto the world, how the case stood with them in England: and to publish some reasons of their actions, especially when after the peace made, and all iniuries forgiuen by them, the Archpriest did not onely not checke these licentious and scandalous proceedings of the Iesuits, broched afresh by them, but gaue them his hand in this action, and incontinently published this licentious*



*and most scandalous libell, which neither hath the authors name, nor is likely euer to be iustified. We haue receiued a resolutiō from our mother citie, that the refusers of the appointed authoritie were schismatikes. And surely I would not giue absolution to any, that should make no conscience thereof, &c. And therefore my direction is, that they make account thereof, and doe make satisfaction, before they receiue the benefite of absolution. Can this Apologie-maker find any such matter in any of the bookes, which he doth impugne, and terme licentious and scandalous proceedings? or can he shew, how the good could be so dangerously infected, or the strongest so greatly troubled by any thing which the priests haue written, as they may be with these treatises, resolutions, or libels of the Iesuits and Archpriest? with what face doth this author carpe at the priests bookes, and say, that the style is most bitter and opprobrious, and nothing sauouring of that spirit, that should be in the seruants of one God? Could there be more bitter speeches, then these before vttered against the priests? or is there any one in those bookes which he impugneth, comparable to those which this fellow himselfe vseth against the priests in this Apologie, calling them children of iniquitie, in the Epistle to his Holines; sometimes Libertines, and other such like, as the spirit moueth him? But these his tricks, not being to be taken by any man of iudgement, but to proceed out of great excesse and passion, & himselfe thereby more likely then the priests to be condemned, he proposeth certaine generall considerations to trouble his discrete Reader: For example: What manner of men these be, that haue aduentured to be the authors of so intollerable a scandall in our English Church: what may be their motiues: what their ends: what their meanes, by secret combining themselves with the enemy, for defaming such, as they most feare and hate: and finally, what may be doubted in the sequell: & how disunited these men be from their lawfull superiours, and consequently from God also, as iustly may be suspected: yet for better enforming the Reader of diuers particularities falsly and vniustly set downe in their late bookes, or infamatorie libels, which I suppose the more pious sort of men will haue scruple to reade or looke vpon, we are, &c. A notable insinuation, that euer-ry man must listen to him and his partners, and must not once looke vpon any thing which the priests alledge for themselves.*

*And*



And this caueat was very necessarily put in here, and conformable to that policie, out of which the *Edicts* proceeded, that no man must see, what the priests could say for themselves, lest that the iugling of their aduersaries should be seene by the Catholics, and they reduced to those, to whome in the end they must adhere, when the true causes of all this diuision are to be ripped vp and iudged.

But if the *discreet reader* would but enter into the first consideration, which is here proposed vnto him, that is, *what manner of men these be*, his discretion will inforce him to heare them. For some of them are of the most ancient Priests in England: some haue suffered long imprisonment, & were neuer touched with anything blame-worthy, before this controuersie began. In the time of greatest need these men haue bene of those, who haue most imployed themselves in all parts of England, and what hath bene praise-worthy done in any disputations at any time with the Protestants, it hath bene by some of them. This therefore, and the like contemptible speeches, as Cap. 9. fol. 119. *such as they be*, and such like, do argue nothing, but an intollerable pride in this Author: who being inferior to many of them for many good parts in them, vseth a little liplabour (the best qualitie which he hath) to disgrace them. In which doubtlesse he will haue bad successe with a *discreet Reader*, and will discouer himselfe and his fellowes, to haue bene *the Authors of this intolerable scandall in our English Church*. The second consideration here proposed to the *discreet Reader* is; *what may be their motives*. And for this the *discreet Reader*, if he wil (as discretion would leade him) looke into their bookes, hee will finde that their *motives* were, to shew how badly the Iesuits, and Arch-priest haue dealt with them; and how vniustly they haue bene defamed of *schisme*, and other enormous crimes, as before is shewed: and that *the end* which they desire is, peace, when the truth shalbe knowen, which so long as it is smothered vp, can neuer breed peace. And thus is the next consideration at an end, which was *what their ends were*. Now followeth, *what their meanes are, by secret combining themselves with the enemy*. But first he must haue told the *discreet Reader*, what *enemy* this was. The priests neuer tooke other for *enemy*, then what they iudged ex-



ror, hauing alwayes honoured the personages of such, as to whom they do owe honour. And if this haue bene now lately perceiued by our Prince, and the State, and thereupon they haue shewed such fauour vnto them, as faithfull and loyall subjects do, or may deserue (notwithstanding the controuersie in Religion) how doeth this fellow call it *a combining with the enemy*? If the priests had at any time done any thing, which they are not ready to iustifie at the feet of his Holines, this good fellow might haue cast some odde surmise into his Readers head: but the contrary being so euident, as the world is now a witnes, the *discreet Reader* need not stand any longer vpon this consideration, nor vpon the next: which is, *what may be doubted in the sequell*: they hauing in this aswell as in any other thing, behaued themselves no otherwise, then hath become Catholicke priests. Lastly the *discreet Reader* must consider *how they are disunited from their lawfull Superior, and consequently from God also*. A simple consequence: but well bebecoming the charitie with which this *Apologie* was written. What bad man in authority wil not thinke himselfe muchbound to this Author for this his consequence? Must he consequently be iustly suspected to bee *disunited from God*, who shall not runne wholly with his *superior*? Cannot a *lawfull superior* do amisse? and in that misdoing may he not be forsaken by those, whose superior he is, without incurring a iust suspition, that they are *disunited from God*? Haue not the priests oftentimes offered to haue these matters scanned and determined (by which the disunion hath growen) with all submission? And hath not the Archpriest refused this offer, and written backe againe vnto them, that *their petition is a tumultuous complaint*? And how then can they be said, *to be disunited from their superior*, and not rather the superior from them? and he in refusing to doe that which is honest and iust, is more *disunited* perchance *from God*, then he taketh himselfe to be, or those who direct him in these his strange courses. After these cōsiderations foloweth a faire promise to bring forth *authenticall proofes* of such matters, as are, or should here be handled. But, they being not yet ready, the *Reader* must content himselfe, with what this Author can at this time affoord him, and hope to see somewhat in a larger *Apologie*. And he will performe this  
in



in a farre other style, then the priests vsed in their bookes, if God *assist vs* (saith he) *with his grace and holy Spirit*. A very good condition, and such as would gladly be seene in any of his actions, and his fellowes: who (both in their *Libel*, which was spread abroad vnder *F. Lister* the Iesuits name, & in this *Apologie*, yea almost immediatly after this godly resolution) are so farre from *Christian spirit*, or ordinary *modesty*, as it could not but be an exceeding ioy to all their friends, to see any iot of Gods grace or assistance of his *holy Spirit* in them. But as it seemeth by the latter end of this preface, there is some kinde of resistance made against this assistance of Gods grace and holy Spirit. Where this author faigning vnto himselfe, that these bookes against which he writeth, could not be published in the style they goe in, by any *modest and Christian spirit*, he concludeth that they are published by some one, or few *discomposed passionate people*, or by some *heretike*, &c. and so as to such, we shall answer (saith he) and not to our brethren: yet doth his answer throughout all the *Apologie* light vpon the *Priests*, although indeede the termes which are vsed, would much better fit an *heretike* against an *heretike*: so little doe they saue either of *modestie*, or *Christian spirit*.

C H A P. 6.

*How this present controuersie about the abuse of this newe subordination is deduced from Iohn of Gaunt, and other matters most impertinent thereunto. Apol. cap. 1.*

**H**Auing shewed through how foule, darke, vn-cuen, and ill saueing an entry this author hath lead his deuoted to this *Apologie*, the indifferent reader may probably coniecture, that in the end there will be nothing to be seene, but a boldnesse in auerring any vntrueth: a sleight in casting mistes before his eyes, to hold him still in ignorance of the trueth: a defect of plaine dealing, when he is driven to say something: and a heape of slanders, with most odious insinuations, to bring the Secular priests into contempt, and obloquy.

In the first chapter of the *Apologie*, intituled, *What great*  
H 4
hurts



*hurts haue come to England by emulation of the Laitie against the Clergie, and of Secular priests against religious, and of the state of the present controuersie in question, he maketh an abridgement of the whole booke following, and contriueith it in such manner, as whereas he beginneth at Iohn of Gaunt, he might asmuch to the purpose haue begunne at the diuision, emulation, and contention, which the enemy raised in Cain against his brother Abel. For although he intitule the Chapter, of hurtes come to England by emulation, and therefore a story of emulation in England may seeme to come necrer to his purpose: yet his discourse being of emulation, by which the reduction of England to the Catholike faith hath bene hindred, he might aswell haue applyed the story of Abel and Cain, as that of Iohn of Gaunt, and Iohn Wickliffe, who were dead, and buried, and this last also had his bones taken vp, and burned about 40 yeeres after, to wit in the yeere 1425. by commandement of Pope Martine the 5. which was an hundreth yeeres before the discontinuance of the Catholike faith in England, or the least declining thereof, as may appeare by the most zealous disposition of K. Henry 8. who in Anno 1521. deserued that most glorious title, Defender of the faith. But let vs see how handsomely he patcheth his geere together: thus he beginneth the first chapter.*

*Ioh. Stow. in vita  
Reg. 2. An. 1384.*

*If euer the enemy of mankind did bestirre himselfe, and all his power to let any publike good of the English nation, it hath bene in this, of the reduction of the Catholike faith. For hindring whercof, he hath tried all his possible meanes, as before we haue noted: but especially that of diuision, emulation, and contention hath bene his chiefeſt. For by emulation of the Nobility against the Clergie, and of Secular priests against religious, he raised Iohn Wickliffe about 200. yeeres past, whom Iohn of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, sonne to King Edward the 3. together with the residue of his faction (upon emulation he had with B. Arundel of London, B. Wickam of Winchester, and others) did set vp, and maintaine against those and the rest of the Clergie: especially against religious men, that had possessions: Wickliffe being a Secular priest himselfe. Thus saith this author: and then he goeth forward, affirming how that certaine motions were made concerning the taking away of the Abbey lands, & giuing them to the Crowne: which motions were made upon the same emulation*  
under



*under the Kings, Richard 2, Henry 4, Henry 5, and others: and tooke effect in the time of King Henry 8. And in the end concludeth, that the want of restitution of Abbey lands was the hindrance of reconciliation in Queene Maries dayes. But this doubtlesse argued rather an vnwillingnesse in the Laitie to part with the Churchliuings, of which they were now in possession, then an emulation in them against the Clergie, or religious. And therefore in this conclusion the Author doth seeme much to forget himselfe, who vndertooke to shew that emulation, and not want of restitution of Church liuings hindered the reduction of England to the Catholike faith. It seemeth that hee aimed onely at this, that (the controuersie being now principally betweene some Secular priests, and some religious) hee might driue into his Readers head some sinister conceit of the Secular priests: and to that ende telleth a tale of the enemye of mankinde, and how hee raysed a Secular Priest against religious: and how that malice tooke effect in K. Henry the 8. dayes, and the Laity would not restore the Church liuings in Q. Maries dayes.*

And if the Reader can put all this together, and cry out against the Secular Priests, *habetur intentum*, as truants vse to say in the schooles, when they knowe not how to deduce the conclusion to their mindes in forme out of the premisses, without laughter in the hearers. We haue before shewed, how that neither by *Wickliffe* nor by *John of Gaunt*, there could be any hinderance of the reducing of England to the Catholike faith: and consequently how impertinent this story is to that, for prooffe whereof it was brought. But for the better discovering of this fellow his falshood and sinister dealing, you shall vnderstand that this *John Wickliffe* was a *Secular Priest*. And although in receiuing that holy Order, he also receiued so indelible a character, as he must be still a Priest, how wickedly soeuer he behaued himselfe: yet he did not receiue any confirmation in grace, but might fall into most great enormities, as the most holy (not confirmed in grace) may doe. And entring out of a melancholy humor, which grew vpon him, by being depriued of a benefice which he had, into a good conceit of himselfe, that he was not *sicut cateri homines*, as other men were, hee changed his life from the ordinary life of the *Secular Priests*, in-



10. Stow in Ed.  
3. An 1377.

to a streighter rule, and tooke another habit. He and all his followers went barefooted, and in course russet garments downe to the heeles, and in contempt of temporall goods, his conuersation was with those *Religious* that had no possessions, and ioined himselfe vnto the begging Fryers, approouing their povertie, and extolling their perfection: Euident tokens that hee had left the state of a *Secular Priest*, and ascended to some higher degree of perfection. But as it should seeme, he was neither Monke nor Frier, but *talis qualis*, such as he was, or as other perchance who came after him, although they follow him not in all things: For as it appeareth in our Chronicles, hee preached against Monkes and other religious men that had possessions, and taught such doctrine, as hee was condemned for it in the Council of *Constance* as an heretike, and his bones were taken vp and burned, as is before said. Whereby also this authour is proued to forget himselfe very much, to number him amongst the Clergie, which is generally taken for such, as are not onely in Orders, but liue also in vnitie of the faith. Wherefore purposing to tell a tale of *emulation* in the Clergie against the *Religious*, he should haue taken some other to haue prooued it, then *Wickliffe*, who also (by his pretence no doubt of greater perfection) had forsaken the state of a *Secular* Clergie man, as appeared by his habit, and conuersation. To these falshoods, and couert calumnies against the *Secular* Priests, this deceit of this author may be added, That whereas the Chronicles doe mention, that not only *John Wickliffe*, but foure doctors of diuinitie also (one of euery Order of the begging Fryers) ioyning with him, were imployed by *John of Gaunt* in his grudge against *Bish. Wickham* of *Winchester*, in whose defence the B. of *London* (not *Arundell*, as this author affirmeth, but *Courtney*) speaking as became him to doe, *John of Gaunt* threatned him also, and swore, that he would pull downe both the pride of him, and of all the Bishops in England: this author mentioneth onely the *Secular* Priest (as he termeth him) without any mention of the orders of Religion, which were also imployed. Moreouer, it foundeth very foolishly, that *John of Gaunt* would set *John Wickliffe* against the Monkes, vpon an *emulation* which hee had against the Bishops, their estates depending so little vpon the estate



estate of the Monkes: as when all the Abbyes in England were put downe, the Bishops remained in as great honour as euer they did. And wheras it is further said, that *the Abbey lands were taken from the Monkes, and giuen to the maintenance of the crowne by the same emulation of the Clergie against the Religious in the time of K. Henry the eight*, it is most false: the Abbyes being then put downe by a change of Religion, which had not the beginning vpon any such emulation as this author affirmeth, but vpon the perswasion of *Longland B. of Lincolne*, the Kings confessor, fortified by *Card. Wolsey*, viz. that his Highnesse mariage with the Lady *Katherine* his brother Prince *Arthurs* wife, was vnlawfull and against the word of God: whereby the King being induced to seeke a diuorce, but crossed therein with the Pope by *Charles* the fift, nephew of the Lady *Katherine*, and some others, as well of the Laytie as the Clergie, both *Secular* and *Religious* here in England, it wrought in the King such a dislike of his Holines, and others, as it procured not onely the ouerthrow of the Abbyes, but such a change in Religion, as since the world hath seene. Of this alteration therefore, if any *emulation* were the beginning, it was an *emulation* in the Cardinall (who dealt with *B. Longland*, to perswade the King, as is mentioned, and afterward did second him with all his might himselfe) against the Emperour, for hindering him of the Popedome: and neither the *sister*, nor the *mother* to ambition (as this author would haue it) but her *daughter*.

But the greatest folly committed by this author in this his *exordium* is not yet touched: and that is, that among all other histories impertinent to the cōtrouersie in question, he would make his choise of one wherein himselfe (if we are not deceiued) is notoriously disciphred. *John Wickliffe* was a Secular priest: being a priest, and neither Monke nor Friar: and no Secular priest as differing from them in habit, and conuersing with the religious Mendicants, vnder pretence of greater perfection. His followers tooke no name of him, as both Monkes and Friars do of their founders, and Sectaries of their Masters: but went vnder the name, which the common people gaue them, to wit, *Lollards*. He was vsed as an instrument by *Iohn of Gant*, to bring that to passe which this Duke had long conceiued



Ioh. Stow. sup.

ued in his mind. For he saw (saith the Historie) that it would be hard for him to obtaine his purpose, the Church standing in his full state, &c. Wherefore he laboured first to ouerthrow as well the liberties of the Church, &c. And to this end did Iohn Wickliffe bestow his talents: for he was not onely eloquent (saith the historie) but also seemed to contemne temporall goods for the loue of eternall riches, &c. This authour, being in a state which once was of Secular priests, now no state of Secular priests: not because he will be taken for either Monke or Frier, or goe barefoote as Iohn Wickliffe did and his followers, or basely clothed (for these are outward mortifications) which of what edification soeuer they are, yet are not worthy of that honour, which is due to the inward mortifications, which lie hid, and are not seene by the corporall eye. But because Pope Gregorie the 13. hath so declared it: yet so as he being *filius populi* (as people say) hath no other name, but what the people giue him, he is imployed not by Iohn of Gant himselfe in his owne person (for this great Duke died about 200 yeeres since) but by Iohn of Gant in some of his posteritie, who hath somewhat to bring to passe, which he hath long conceiued in his mind: for the effecting of which, this godly Father is busied in the corrupting the Cleargie of England, or the vtter ouerthrowing it: which at this present, he and his doe worke by taking from them their good name and fame, and making them odious without iust cause, to the people. And to the end that he would be knowen not to haue spent his time idly in Wickliffe his schoole, he hath not onely imployed his tongue, but his pen also: and in his first platforme of Reformation hath ordeined, that none of the Clergie shall possesse any temporall liuings, but shall liue upon such pensions, as shall to certaine of his company and some secular Priests (ioyned with them) in their wisdome seeme necessary for their maintenance. But let vs now see whether this authour can fit himselfe better in the next point.

In the beginning also (saith he) of this Queenes dayes, the little affection which the Laitie did beare vnto the Clergie, procured by some vnquiet spirits, as also the small union of diuers Clergie men among themselues, some holding with the heretikes and politikes by beate of faction, was a great occasion of the totall ouerthrow of religion,



gion, whereupon also the same deuill brought in the diuision of opinions, about going to the hereticall Churches and seruice, which most part of Catholikes did follow for many yeeres: and when the better and truer opinion was taught them by Priests and Religious men from beyond the seas, as more perfect and necessarie, there wanted not many that opposed themselves, especially of the elder sort of Priests of *Q. Maries* dayes. And this diuision was not onely fauoured by the Councell, but nourished also for many yeeres, by diuers troublesome people of our owne, both in teaching and writing. See how shametully he followeth still this bug emulation. If the little affection in the *Laitie* towards the Clergie, and litle union amongst the Clergy themselves, were then culpable, what reward must they haue, who now haue effected the same to the ouerthrow of religiō, which by the great paines of many religious Priests, hath gotten root in many? But to our purpose. It is euident that no emulation was cause of the change of the Catholike Romane religion, professed in her sisters time, but her Maiesties conscience, I must thinke: her Highnesse hauing bene euer trained vp, both in her fathers, and brothers times, in the religion of the Protestants, and following to that purpose the counsell of such as thought not so well of the Church of Rome, as of the Religion that is now professed, as may appeare by such actes as are registred to haue bene done presently vpon her Maiesties coming to the Crowne. But as for the Catholikes their going to the Church, it was somewhat more to be lamented perchance, then to be blamed, before it came to be a *signe distinctiue*, by which a Catholike was known from one, who was no Catholike. For this consideration onely in the iudgement of the Iesuities in their Romane Colledge, made the going to Church vnlawful in England, as we haue heard M. *James Younger* (afterwarde Doctor of Diuinitie) affirme, who presented vnto them the discourse, which *Bell* made in defence of going to the Church with a protestation.

*Io. Stow. in Eliz.  
An. 1. 1559.*

It is also well knownen that Fa. *Bosgraue* the Iesuite, at his first comming ouer into England, went to Church, vntill hee vnderstood, that now it was become a *signe distinctiue*, and was excused for that fact by his ignorance of the then present state of our Countrey: himselfe comming from such places, where



it was not takē for so heinous a matter to go to the Protestants Church. *F. Alexander* & his fellow Iesuite may much more fitly be said in the spirit of this author, to be the devils instrumēt in Scotland, by *bringing in a diuision of opinions* about going to the puritanical assemblies, after that the Catholikes there had been instructed by the *secular* priests of the danger therof, & forbore those meetings: wherby it was become also there a *signe distinetive*. But whensoever any troublesome of any sort hath either in teaching, or writing nourished this, or any other diuision, bending this way, the *Secular* priests haue shewed themselves most vigilant & constant in the defence of vnity, and the safety of our English Church: as it very well appeared by *M. Io. Musb* his labours against *Bell* in the North: his & *M. Watsons* confirmation of the Catholikes in Scotland against those Iesuits, *Fa. Alexander* & his felowes: & the standing against *Fa. Walley* and *Fa. Southwel*, (two Iesuits) in the South by *M. Collington*, and *M. Charnock*, when these Iesuits did teach the Catholikes (who were called to the barre openly at Assises or Sessions, in the yeere 1591) that they might lawfully (to keepe themselves out of prison, for not going to the Church) yeeld to goe to this or that learned Protestant to cōferre with him in matters of their faith: which could imply no other (at the least in the face of the world) then a doubt of their faith, or a contentment to be instructed in their faith by such, as in their conscience they tooke for heretikes: and consequently it was a deniall of their faith before men, if this axiome keepe his old authority: *Dubius in fide est infidelis: He that is doubtfull in his faith is an infidell*. But after all this trouble was ended, *Fa. Southwell* (as we vnderstand) imployed *M. Standish* to tell *M. Charnocke*, that hee was now of mind, that it was a thing vnlawfull. And *Fa. Walley* told *M. Collington* that his meaning was onely, that the Catholikes should go to the houses of the learned Protestants, not to conferre with them, but rather as a temporall punishment, to quit them from going to prison: which how ridiculous a shift it is, any man of meane vnderstanding may easily perceiue, and also what kinde of people they were, whom it was likely the Councell did most fauour, if they would debase themselves to deale in such offices, as the Author of the *Apologie* doth here affirme.

And



And thus much for his second passage.

The third matter which here he affirmeth is, that certaine Catholicks liked not, that the Catholicke English Clergie should be restored at the least by way of a Seminary, which was begunne at *Doway*. which because it passeth my capacitie, I will not enter into, further then this; that they were strange Catholicks, of what nation soeuer they were ( that Seminary not hauing any rule, by which the Students were bound to any thing more, then to studie Diuinitie, after which they might dispose of themselues as they would) but this Author saith, that those Catholicks their letters are yet to be scene: and perchance they will come foorth with the larger *Apologie*, and giue credite to this so strange an assertion. In the meane while this Author will goe forward with the narration of those hurts and difficulties, which vpon emulation haue fallen out in this our English cause vnder the *Queene* that now is, especially concerning the *Seminaries*, &c. But first as it should seeme the Gentleman must haue a pipe of Tobacco, for that his stomack is marueilous full: and before he can come to this narration, he must disgorge himselfe. Hauing therefore told his Reader, how that some Catholicks were against the restoring of the English Clergie (as is before shewed) thus he easeth himselfe: *And forsomuch as the principall and onely ground of this our present contention, and scandalous controuersie, is the very same disease of emulation, partly of Laymen against Priests, and partly of Priests against religious men ( especially the Fathers of the Societie, with whom at this present they haue to do) and that this emulation is accompanied with apparant wicked sisters and daughters, as Ambition, enuie, hatred, contention, malice, pride, malediction, and other like: it is an easie thing for our brethren and others, to discerne, from what root these buds doe spring: and consequently, either to auoyd them in themselves, or that other men be carefull to take heed of them.*

See I pray you, what lothsome stuffe here is: and so peremptorily set downe, as it doeth most liuely represent the knowen old medicine to kill fleas, by putting dust in their mouthes. If but halfe of these matters here alledged were proued against the Priests, doubtlesse they were to be auoyded by Catholicks, as such as wanting no faults in themselues, would hardly instruct



struct others in vertue. But this Author being not as yet settled to his *Apologie*, without doubt discovereth that hee is not free from all those vices, which he hath reckoned (if he want any of them) who vpon so smal, or rather no cause, or euidence, would haue his Reader to enter into so rash, and vile a iudgement of the *Secular* priests, as though his *Apologie* were to no purpose, vnlesse his Reader would carry such an vncharitable conceit of them, as there should be no need of any *Apologie*, or defence of those who are their aduersaries. But now to his ground of this present contention.

*The principall, or onely ground (saith he) of this our present contention and scandalous controuersie, is the very same disease of emulation, partly of Lay men against Priests, and partly of Priests against religious men: especially the Fathers of the Societie, with whom at this time they haue to doe, &c.* We haue before shewed that the emulation of the *Laitie* against the *Cleargie* (of which he speaketh before) was, for that the *Cleargie* were thought to be an hinderance to some designments of the *Laitie*: and thereupon some few deuised how to indomage the *Cleargie*. The emulation also which was said to haue bene in the *Cleargie* against the religious, hath bene shewed not to haue bene in the *Cleargie*, but in *Wickliffe* and his societie, surnamed by the people *Lollards*. And if any of the *Cleargie* may be said to haue ioyned with *Wickliffe* in that his insolent and heretical attempt, they were of the *Religious* cleargie, and not of the *Secular*. And this emulation was against the religious who had possessions. Now then (good sir) if *the principall or onely ground of this our present contention and scandalous controuersie is the very same disease of emulation*: you must shew what like cause the Lay men haue found in the *Cleargie*, or the Priests in the Religious, especially the *Fathers of the Societie*, who by their rule haue no properties, nor can possesse any thing, as *M. T. W.* would haue vs to thinke. We haue giuen a cause before of the contrary part, why the Lay men (who follow the Iesuits) and the Iesuits also may be thought to stirre vp themselues against some *Secular* Priests: to wit, because that some of the *Secular* Priests cannot bee brought to like of such plots, as the Iesuits haue layd for the inuasion of our Countrey, in which they haue imployed themselves

*Ich. Seor in  
Edw. 3. Anno  
1377.*

*T. W. in his di-  
gression from the  
16. Martyrs.  
pag 63.*



selues oftentimes, and thrust also some Secular Priests into the action (although most grieuously against their wills) namely in the yeere 1596. And if this Author had not vsed this parenthesis speaking of Religious men (*especially the Fathers of the Societie, with whom at this present they haue to do*) we should neuer haue dreamed, that this digression from hurts done in this Queenes dayes, had bene made against the Priests, who stand vpon their defence, against the impostures of the Iesuits, and their adherents, because so sinall a number of the Laity, doe stand with those priests, and the priests themselues are so few, (by this good fellow his accompt) as he disdaineth much, that they are called *the priests*. And in the 11. Chap. of the *Apol.* fol. 162. he alledgeth it for the second *abuse, sleight or shift*, which was vsed towards his Holines in the title of the booke dedicated vnto him: wherein it is said, that *the troubles were betweene the Iesuits on th'one side with the Archpr. &c, and the Seminary priests on th'other side*. But no doubt herein this fellow his memory did faile him, as also in another matter there mentioned: For whereas here he affirmeth, that *the principall, & only ground of this our present contention, and scandalous controuersie, is the very same disease of emulation, partly of Lay men against priests, and partly of Priests against religious men, especially the Fathers of the Societie*: In the 11. Chap fol. 161. & 162. hee affirmeth, that *the Priests their controuersie is with the Archpr. &c. and that their stomacke against the Iesuits is for standing with him, and for him*. So as by this reckoning the case is plainly altered: For if the principall, and onely ground of this our present contention, and scandalous controuersie, be the very same disease of emulation, partly of Laymen against Priests, and partly of Priests against religious men, especially the Iesuits: to which of these two members will this Author bring this controuersie, which in the 11. Chap. he saith is *betweene Priests, and their Archpriest*? he cannot bring it to the first, which is of Lay men against Priests, for then hee must accompt the Priests (betweene whom, and the Archpr. the controuersie is) or the Archpr. among Lay men, which I trust he will not. He cannot bring it to the second, which is of Priests against Religious. For then the Archpr. (betweene whom, and the priests is the controuersie) must be confessed to be religious:



which also (as I weene) he will not say : especially, that he is a *Iesuit*, as hee expoundeth himselfe , or a *Father* of the *Societie*, with whom at this present ( as he saith here ) *they* ( the priests ) *haue to doe*. For at this he laughed, Num. 16. in his *table of falsehoods*. But perchance his straying to disgorge himselfe, caused a lightnes in his head, that he knew not well what hee said. The filth then before shewed , being now out of his stomacke, *For better declaration of this matter* ( saith he ) *I shall goe forward with the narration of those hurts , and difficulties, which upon emulation haue fallen out in this our English cause, vnder the Queene that now is, especially concerning the Seminarie, and the reduction of England by that way , and meane procured, for these 20. yeeres, and more : to wit , since the beginning of the Romane English Colledge, which was in the yeere 1578. at what time a contention beganne betweene M. Doct. Lewis then Archdeacon of Cambray , but after B. of Cassana, and the English schollers, about the maner of gouernment, and gouernors of that house , erected especially by his procurement, and industry.*

He hath shewed you before, what hurt came to England by the *emulation* which some Catholicks had against the restoring of a new English Clergie at *Doway* , which notwithstanding, the Seminary there florished : and afterward also at *Rhemes* in France in such sort , as England ( thanks be to God ) did not feelee that hurt, vntill new Lords came, who were of the *Iesuits* faction, and were forced sometime to runne with them, for some respects, how smal soeuer their inward deuotion was vnto them. Now he will giue you to vnderstand what great hurt our English cause hath had by *emulation*, which was at Rome. And because he will take all before him, he saith that Doctor *Lewis* ( after B. of *Cassana* ) and the schollers fell out about the *maner of gouernment and gouernours of the house*, which doubtlesse if this fellow had any respect to the good reputation of the Schollers, hee would haue concealed, the house being *erected, especially by that man his procurement and industry*, as here it is confessed. For in reason, who would not haue expected, to haue borne some sway in that of which he might iustly haue bene called in some sort a founder, being moreouer a man of great wisdom and integritie? But this Author thinketh



thinketh it good policie, to conceale *Fa Parsons* presence at Rome at that time, lest that the riddle should be read otherwise then hee would haue it, and the cause of dissension deciphered. The trueth is, that *F. Parsons* was there, and there needeth no more to be said. And hee did deale with the schollers vnder hand, & as secretly as he might, but failed of the Rectorship, if he sought it: although *T. VV.* in his *digression from the 16 martyrs*, pag. 53. amongst other his follies doth affirme, that the first Rector of this Colledge was *F. Robert Parsons*, &c. And to say that the Councell did lay hands presently, hoping thereby to keepe a perpetuall diuision in our nation, is to argue the Councell of a great ouersight, and want of consideration, that a diuision in a nation prooueth oftentimes a desolation or vtter ouerthrowe thereof. But let vs see what substantiall prooffe there is of this assertion: For which cause (sayth this Author) diuers spies were sent ouer to nourish the said diuision, as namely one *Vanne* (if we remember well) who died in the Inquisition at Rome in the yere 1581. and soone after they vsed another named *Salomon Alread*, a Taylor by his trade, and married first at Lyons in France: but after getting acquaintance at Rome, and *Millaine*, hee became a statesman, went in and out diuers times to the Councell of England, vntill at last being discovered, he remained for seruant with *Sir Fran. Walsingham* the 2<sup>d</sup> Secretarie: and lastly, professed heresie. *Vanne* is said to be employed by the Counsell, to nourish this diuision in our nation; but what hee did, it is not said: this the reader himselfe must imagine: neither is it said, with whome he ioyned, when he came to Rome, or with whom he dealt: onely it is said, that he dyed in the Inquisition; which argueth that hee was some obstinate heretike. And this example is as foolishly brought, to prooue emulation in the Laytie against the Clergie, as that of *Wickliffe* was to prooue emulation of the Clergie against the religious, both being heretickes: and consequently neither of them of that body, of which we are to vnderstand this Author when he talketh of the Laytie and Clergie, vnlesse he will also take that word *Religious* to extend it selfe to such Apostata Iesuits, as are either at *Geneua*, or elsewhere. And then will hee make himselfe ridiculous in affirming, that emulation against such religious should hinder the reduction of England to the



Cath. faith. *Salomon Alread* was a Catholike, and a great devote of the Iesuits, both at *Lyons* in France and elsewhere. And if by his peuking, he did at any time discover what he received of them, this author (who neglecteth the credit of all whatsoever, to save the Iesuits credit) should have covered it, not having named any place of this mans conversation, where hee should become a *Statesman*, but such as where the Iesuits were his directors, as *Lyons* in France, *Rome*, and *Millaine*. And if after the edification he had of the Iesuits, he returned into England, and offered his service to Sir *Francis Walsingham* her Majesties Secretarie, Sir *Francis* had little reason to refuse him, or not to imploy him, although we cannot learne that ever he did any harme in the English Colledge at Rome. And therefore this example of emulation in the Laytie against the Clergie, is as small to the purpose as the former. His being a *Taylor* might perchance make to the purpose in this authors conceit; but his being a *married man*, is doubtlesse here mentioned, for no other end then to put vs in mind, that married men can play the merchants as well as others: as if wee had forgotten, that as the Councell did second the Iesuits (who were not married) in the first diuision at the College of Rome by sending *Vanne* thither, (as this author sayth) who was an vnmarried man, so did the Iesuits second the Coucels imploiment of this *Solomon Alread*, (who was married) in the furthering of their faction in the same Colledge at Rome, by entertaining *Pierce* amongst some other straglers, who was also a married man, and his wife knownen to be liuing, to make vp a small number of 8. or 10. pious youths, (as the Iesuites did terme them) to stand with them against all the rest of the students in the Colledge: yet in this one trick the Iesuits went beyond our Councell, in that they made their married man *Cornutus*, by putting him in a square cappe, the better to effect that which they did by his means. For this was he, who after many deuises, preuailed at the last with three of the Students, to go to a Tauerne to drinke, where they were no sooner set, then apprehended by the *Sbirri*. And the matter was made so odious, as hereby they lost the fauor of his Hol. & were brought into a most seruile subiectiō to the Iesuits, not without the great grief of their friends, who long after complained, that they



they had very euill handled a good cause. And although these were the first stratagems, which were layd open to the world: yet were diuers causes giuen of disquietnes, euen from the first foundation of that Colledge: For the Iesuits hauing gotten the gouernement thereof into their hands, and in such sort, as they were most earnestly requested thereunto by such, as (howsoeuer this Author doth bragge of them, and their petitions to his Holinesse) confessed not long after, that *they knew not what they had done*; they began to strike (as we say) while the iron was hot, and laboured a couple of the Students to become Iesuits, to wit, *Thomas Wright*, and *Iohn Barton*, who were well esteemed of for their towardlinesse. And although both of them did afterward leaue the societie of the Iesuits: yet their present example, together with the Iesuits bad indeuours, was occasion of much disunion of mindes in the Colledge: which when it was perceiued, the Iesuits the better to norish this diuision, & to couer their owne dealings, imployed such of the Students in that office, as had already deuoted themselues vnto their societie: and did countenance them against those, who complained thereof: insomuch as it was too apparant, that some were of purpose deferred, or kept from going into the societie of the Iesuites, to the end they might perswade others to the same course, which was in deed the vndoing of that Colledge. For now the Students did not know, how to discerne one of their owne fellowes from the Iesuits, which began to swarme amongst them; and grew in the end to that malapartnesse, as they laughed, and iested at the Students to their faces: yet must all be accounted the worke of the spirit. And if this spirit were at any time found, then to bleare the Students eyes, it was deuised, that no man did perswade any to leaue the Colledge, to become Iesuits: but did onely eleuate the mindes of such good wits, as were capable thereof, to a desire of some higher state of perfection: In which when they had once preuailed, and that the student was now resolved thereupon, and consequently to leaue that course in which he was, by being a member of the Colledge, they did the more boldly aske this question, why the Student, minding to leaue the Colledge, and betake himselfe to a state of greater perfection, or security, might

Chap. 5. fol. 28.



might not be exhorted to be a Iesuite rather then of any other order of religion. By which poore shifts the Iesuits were often discouered, that they sought their owne honour more, then the good, either of the Colledge, or of our countrey: both which, through these occasions, haue come pretily forward to vtter ruine. And these were the troubles, which this Author mentioneth in this *Apologie*, cap. 11 fol. 170. although he would seem to smother them vnder a much-making of M. *Mush*, who was a principall instrument of the Iesuits in this disturbance of the Colledge, *and he is not ashamed to obiect to the Fathers* (saith this author) *their partialitie towards some, more then towards other, and all this to draw yong men to their societie, whereas in the former we know by experience, and can testifie that no other thing euer wrought the Fathers more trouble in the Colledge, while this man was there, then their ouer much loue and fauour to him above his merits, as other men thought, and yet was not this to draw him to their societie, seeing they would not admit him in so many yeares, as he pretended to enter, foreseeing (as may be thought) his perillous nature, &c.* His seruice we may see how much it was worth vnto him: he was kept out, as many are, in all places where there are Iesuites; because being Iesuits, they cannot but with too great a wracke of modestie, so inordinately commend them, as they must be commended, nor, without demonstration of excessiue desire of riches, importunate others, to giue them such lands, and goods, as are not to be lost for want of asking, which while no Iesuits do hunt after, they are thrust vpon them (good men) and with all charity are imbraced, with most godly intention, to be bestowed *in pios vsus*. But it shall be alwayes in the Iesuites choice, to receiue such a purueyor into their order: and he must during life be in a seruite estate, ready to attempt, what they shall commaund him (for their intreaties are also commandements) or els he shall be turned going with his livery. *They would not admit him, foreseeing (as may be thought) his perillous nature.* But to leaue such fooles in their expectation of a like reward, after so many yeres better seruice to them, then vnto their Countrey (although wee make no doubt, but some thinke they doe well, and that all is gold that glistereth) we will returne to examine that which followeth concerning the great harmes,



harmes, which this authour hath espied to haue come to England, through *emulation* (as hee pretendeth) of others: but least these two, to wit, *Vanne* and *Alread*, should not seeme enough, to conuince *the great hurt, which hath come to England by emulation of the Laity against the Clergie*, this author inculcateth to his reader, that the Councel stil pursued this office of stirring diuision between the followers of *D. Allen*, and *D. Lewis*, for both whom he doeth here giue his word, that it was much against their willes, although not long after *fol. 5.* he calleth the one an emulator of the other. But to let this passe, and to beare with this poore man, whose memory seemeth to be very greatly ouercharged with this *Apology*, we must also vnderstand, that *this plot of the Councel was much holpen by a new accident: and that was, that certaine Gentlemen, hauing once ioyned (as it should seeme with D. Allen, Fa. Parsons, and Sir Francis Inglesfield, and the rest of the body of Catholikes at home and abroad, in certaine affaires of our Countrey, parted sometime from them: and by going another way, among other inconueniences thereupon ensuing, ouerthrew the Queene of Scots.* A prooffe to serue a poore turne, & very impertinent in this place: yet such, as were it not a discredit for wise men to take aduantage of a maddemans words, it were sufficient to call all Cath. in question, and those affaires, what they were, in which *the whole body of them aswel at home as abroad, were vnited, especially it being here mentioned, that the going of some another way was the Queene of Scots her ouerthrow.* But rather then these fellowes will lacke matter, they will tell a hundreth idle tales, with little regard what danger may come to those who are vpon ignorance wholly deuoted vnto them.

*About this time also, (saith this authour) and soone after, diuers impugnations were attempted at Rome against the Seminaries and missions of England by men of opposite spirit and emulation. But here is not shewed, what hurt came vpon this emulation, but rather contrariwise it is shewed, that there came no hurt. And if there had come any, yet had this bene farre from his purpose, vnlesse he did shew it to haue bene an emulation in the Laitie against the Clergie, or in the Clergie against the religious. And not onely lay men, but diuers Priestes also, brought vp in the Seminaries*



ries (saith he) were drawn by little and little to be of this faction against D. Allen, Fa. Parsons, and the Iesuits: and namely some in Rome, as appeareth by a visitation, yet extant sent to the English College by Pope Sixtus in the yeere 1585, &c. At this time, as we are informed, there was a visitation. And if those men should be named, who were then noted for factious, the Iesuites would startle, and many of their friends. But vnlesse some cause be giuen of descending to more particulars, wee will say no more, then that the principall (then accounted) of the faction, coming afterward into England, and not finding amongst the secular priests any, who would consent with them in such their factious humours, are become Iesuites: in which estate they may hope to keepe themselves at the least in vire for that humour. Other some although they doe not professe to be Iesuites, yet they sticke so close vnto them, as *aiō* doth to *aiunt*, *nego* to *negant*. And for so much as we can learne, that *emulation* was not against D. Allen: for as it appeared very well, he was so much honoured by them all, as at his worde the principall of them, and who is now a Iesuit, made publique submission, and in expresse words acknowledged his error, in that he had not so long a time obserued that saying, *Qui nescit dissimulare, nescit viuere: he that knoweth not how to dissemble, knoweth not how to liue*. How farre foorth M.D.B. (noted in the margent) was a cause of that visitation, I know not: but if we doe not mistake the man, hee was sent into England long before this visitation came to the College. And as for the other two Priests, whose names are set in the margent in this sort, G.G.E.G. who are said to haue conspired with the Councell in England, and for more grace, and gratification, haue writ two mischieuous bookes, the one (saith this authour) against D. Allen, the other against F. Parsons and the Iesuites, giuing them vp to Walsingham the *Queenes* Secretarie, affirming also among other points, to make the parties more odious (as our men their successours doe at this day) that these men depended of Spaniards, and were enemies to their Countrey: We heartily wish that this authour may liue in as good credit as the one of them liueth, after all his trouble in Italy, or elsewhere, and die as penitent as the other died, after his troubles in France. He who writ against the Iesuites, was



too priuie to their actions, aswell in England, as elsewhere to be deceiued in them. And if the Appellants be the men, whom here this authour meaneth by these words, *their successors*, they may purge themselues very well from any offence in hauing the like thought. For it is well knowen, that *Fa. Parsons* in Spaine caused many aswell others as Priestes to subscribe, as priests, to the title of the *Infanta*, now Dutches of *Burgundie*. *Fa. Tancard* also hath made many to set their handes to three blanks, although some refused to do it, as they haue themselues reported, at their returne into England. We haue moreouer vnderstood, that *Fa. Parsons* was a chiefe dealer in the sending of those Armadoes which the Spaniards haue set out for the inuasion of our Countrey: and there are in England, with whome hee dealt most earnestly, to goe in the Nauie which was set out in the yeere 1596. who, refusing to be imployed in any action against their Countrey, were for that cause sent away from the College, & told, that it was not conuenient that they should stay in the College, where they had giuen example of such repugnance. There is moreouer sufficient prooffe, that after the euill successe of the Spanish attempts, *Fa. Parsons* carried a youth to the king of Spaine, who pronounced a certaine speech for the purpose, which being ended, *Fa. Parsons* began to vrge the king to giue one attempt more, affirming that he (silly fellow) would write his letters into England, and nothing doubted to effect, what should be to the great furtherance of such a iourney. We haue also certaine intelligence, that the Iesuites had deuised a meanes, to haue had the tower of London seized into their hands, and how they would haue it held vntil the Spaniard came to rescue them. Diuers of their letters haue bin shewed to diuers prisoners for prooffe against them, when they haue answered in defence of the Iesuites, that they thought them free from such stratagems. And amongst the rest, there is one of the 10. of Iune 1596. wherein there are these wordes: *It may be, if the kings faintnesse and pusillanimitie hinder vs not (as heretofore it hath) the Armado will be with you about August, or September. This is one good helpe, Ireland wilbe onely for vs. The Earle of Tyrone and Odonell would gladly haue helpe from hence, and they are well contented to let the Spaniards*



There were 200.  
copies of these  
proclamations  
printed in Spaine,

niards haue certaine holdes and forts for their uses. This will greatly pleasure to trouble and disquiet England, and in the mean time serue for harbour for the ships, that shall passe that way, &c. It were necessary you should make it knowne aforehand, that no Cath. man or woman shall take harme, either in body or goods. Let euery man be quiet till the Spaniards be landed, then shall there presently proclamation be made of all securitie. Certaine other letters also haue bene seene of F. Parsons to his fellow Iesuits in England, wherein he hath wished, that the Catho. would vnite themselves together, & ser vp a king of England. And in his letters of the 24. of Ianu. 1600. to the Earle of Anguise, he confesseth that he dealt in such matters for 8. or 10. yeeres. But if all these, and many other, as infallible proofes did faile vs, F. Parsons booke of *Succession* would so farre conuince his dealing in State matters, in the behalfe of Spaine, as the Appellantes may without scruple charge him with it, yet without any intention to make him more odious, knowing it a thing very impossible, if they were so minded. And thus much concerning this authour his folly in indeuouring to gall the Appellantes with the name of *Successors* to such as affirmed that the Iesuites depended of the Spaniards, and were enemies to their Countrey.

The next fit of emulation here mentioned is against D. Allen, when he was to be made a Cardinall, and it is set out with a very rich margent, and much to our present matter in controuerisie I warrant you.

But not beeing able to preuaile in this against the Card. himselfe, (sayth this author) they began to set more earnestly against the Iesuits his chiefe friends and constant defenders, as well in stirring up the schollers in Rome against the Fathers that gouerned them, as also to make a faction against them by Secular Priests in England; as may appeare by a letter of the Cardinals owne, written most earnestly not sixe moneths before his death to a priest named Mush, &c. There is a speciall Treatise comming forth, of the troubles of that Roman English Colledge, to which I am to referre the Reader, and to note no other thing in this place, then that the misdemeanours of the Iesuits was the cause of all those troubles. But concerning this foolish assertion, that there was a faction against the Iesuits by Secular priests in England, the contrary is most cleare



as all England may witnesse: and there is a letter extant of M. George Blackwell (the now Archpriest) wherein hee inueigheth mightily against those, who had made the report, that the priests and Iesuites were at strife. And this letter is kept in the English Colledge at Rome, & registred as an Oracle, although perchance not for this clause so much, as for the immoderate, but false extolling of the Iesuits, in doing infinite deeds of charitie out of the profits of their patrimonies, *nam minima sunt, &c.* (sayth M. Black.) *it is not worth the speaking of, which they receiue of almes, &c.* And whereas the Card. Allen his letter is here brought to testifie a faction of either the schollers at Rome, or the Secular priests in England against the Iesuits, it is a meere mockery, as may appeare by the letter it selte, for so much as is set downe to this purpose in this *Apologie*, cap. 2. fol. 11. where we find these words: *I haue heard to my great grieve, that there is not that good correspondence betweene the Fathers and other priests. I cannot tell vpon what discontentment, &c. But whereof soeuer it commeth, it is of the enemye, and with all possible discretion and diligence by the wiser sort on both sides to be rooted out, or els it wil be the ruine of the whole cause, &c. And therefore in this point (especially M. Mush) be earnest and peremptory with all parties, and euery one in particular, &c.* By which we vnderstand not, how it may rather be gathered, that there was a factiō by the Secular priests against the Iesuits, then that there was a faction by the Iesuits against the Secular priests: neither is here any relation to any former speech had with him, as doubtlesse there would haue bene, had M. Mush giuen any such information to him, but rather the contrary, as may be gathered by these wordes: *I haue heard to my great grieve, &c.* which argueth, that this was put into his head by some other, that this being before layd for a ground, they might afterward build thereon to their owne best liking, nothing at any time being accounted so much their honor and glory, as others falling out: which howsoeuer they doe vnderhand nourish it, while they would seeme to remedy it, maketh them wise and charitable purueyours for the common cause, and what not (good men) beeing as innocent of these broyles and diuisions, as *Sinon* was of the betraying of *Troy*. Moreouer, it may appeare by this letter, that the Car. had a very great

January 1596. to  
the C. Caictane.



good conceit of M. *Mush*, who would employ him in a matter in which lay *the ruine of the whole cause*: and therefore willed him to be *earnest, yea and peremptory with all parties*. His good affection was also shewed, in that at his coming into England, he perswaded the Pope, to giue vnto him very speciall faculties and power to name, at his returne into England, to a certaine number, who *hoc ipso* should haue the like. And yet this author is not ashamed in this place, to set downe to his discredit these words: *Having bene with the Cardinall at Rome, and having done some euill offices, as is presumed, &c. the Card. perceiuing his humour, wrote most effectually to him, and by him to others against this diuision and faction, but little preuailed*. And in the margent there is a note of the aboue cited letters, which as they are set downe in the *Apologie*, are a most absurd instance to proue thus much, as is here presumed of the Cardinals sinister conceit of M. *Mush*, as that it was farre from trueth, which was auowed, that *the Cardinall was disunited from the Fathers before he died*. For thus this author maketh his tale hang together: *But it little preuailed, as now appeareth: onely it may serue to prooue how false and farre from trueth it is, which he (M. Mush) and others of his faction doe auow in their bookes, that the Cardinall was disunited from the Fathers before he died: for that he said, as they relate, that when he should be dead, farre greater troubles and oppositions would fall out against the Iesuits: which may be true, for that he saw so much emulation against them, by Libertines and factious people, already begun in his time, which yet were reteined somewhat from breaking forth by this authoritie while hee liued*. But the Cardinall liuing yet fixe moneths longer, what prooffe could this letter be, that hee was not disunited from the Iesuits before he died? Or what prooffe is it of any such vnion to the Iesuits, when he writ it, as it could not be likely, that hee was disunited, before he died he willeth Master *Mush* to be *earnest and peremptory with all parties*: in which words the Iesuites are included, aswell as the Secular priests, and consequently the Cardinall was peremptorily conceited, that somewhat was amisse in the Iesuits, or else hee would not haue bene so bold with them, as he might (vpon any small occasion) with the Secular, of whom he had a particular charge. To our remembrance also the words of the Cardinall related  
vnto



vnto vs, were not those which are here cited, to wit, that when he was dead, *farre greater troubles and oppositions would fall out against the Iesuits*; but, that there would be very great troubles by the Iesuits their ambitious courses & bad carriages towards the Secular priests. And this gloze, that he foresaw so much emulation against them *by Libertines and factious people*, is piously made by this authour, that the reader should be out of doubt what *spirit* it is which doeth *assist* him in the making of this his necessary *Apologie*.

But the good Cardinall being dead in the yeere 1594. all factions (saith this fellow) *brake out together against the Iesuits, destitute now of the Cardinals assistance, &c.* This Author mistaketh the matter: For after the Cardinals death, the Iesuits began their raigne in euery place, where any English were resident, as at Rome, and in England, especially at *Wisbich*, where, through the folly of the Lay Catholicks, they had greatest hope to preuaile first, and afterward to haue an easier conquest of the rest. The stirres & troubles of Rome are particularly to be set downe in a discourse thereof, whither wee are to referre the Reader. The stirres in England began at *Wisbich* by the insolencie of the Iesuits there in durance, *F. Weston, F. Buckley, F. Bolton* and others, who had deuoted themselues particularly to their order, or passed their vowes in secret. And to effect this the better, the Lay gentlemen, by whose charitie the Castle had bene relieued, were dealt withall by the Iesuits, or their factious adherents, to withdraw their charitie from all those, who would not subiect themselues to *F. Weston* the Iesuit, by whose instructions it is most falsly here auowed, that the company had liued a *Collegiall and religious manner of life*: for before hee came thither they liued indeed in such sort, but after his comming, his ambitious humor disturbed the whole house, as it is set downe in a booke already published of *The stirres at Wisbich*. And as for the stirres, which were in the Low-countries, the cause is here in patt set downe by the Author of the *Apologie*, to wit, that *Fa. Holt*, and *M. Hugh Owen* were deemed partiall against some, and did not further them for the getting of their pensions. But as it should seeme these two had some intent, in which because those other would not ioyne with them, they



were accompted as factious, and not worthy of the Spanish charitie. *F. Holt* was sufficiently known to haue bene a notorious actor in the yeere 1588. and was not without cause thought, through his folly, to haue bene the cause of the death of the duke of *Parma*. His treacherie was afterward better discovered, in his imploying of *Hesket*, who was executed at *S. Albones* for his seruice done to the same *F. Holt* the Iesuit, and other the plotters of the raising of the noble *Ferdinand Earle of Darby* to the Crowne of England, by the assistance of *Sir William Stanley*, and other such like. After which the good *Earle* likewise enioyed his life but a little while, but died an vntimely death in the prime of his age. How farre forward this *Owen* also, mentioned here, might be in these actions, we leaue it to men of vnderstanding; he being pew-fellow with *F. Holt* in the English affaires, as it should seeme by this Author. And certaine letters of his of the 5. of *April 1596*, doe shew euidently, that he was a dealer with the Spanish faction against England. And whereas this Author, among other his impertinent stuffe, doeth here gird at the dimission of *M.D.B.* out of the English Colledge at Rome, to quit perchance the story of that infamous expulsion of *F. Parsons* out of *Baliol Colledge* in *Oxford*: he hath made his answer to this, and set it to *M. D. Ely* his notes vpon the *Apologie*. But this is also here to be noted, that he was sent into England very honourably, and was admitted into the sodalitie of our *Lady*, which was at that time a fauour so ioyned with those, who were esteemed well of by the Iesuits, as if any of that sodalitie had bene factious, or behaued themselves contrary to their liking, they were expelled, or reduced to a kinde of Nouiceship, as some Iesuits in England can testifie. This also is certaine, that the visitation, of which there is mention made in this *Apologie* to haue bene about that time, was long after his departure, vpon an open breach, and parts-taking in the Colledge, betweene the Iesuits, and many of the Students.

And thus much concerning *Iohn of Gaunt*, *Iohn Wickliffe*, the dissolution of *Abbeys* in the time of *King Henry the 8.* the *Q. Mary Priests*: the going to Church: the emulation against the institution of the *Seminaries*: the dealings of the Counsell by spies, to further the diuision begun in, and for the *Seminaries*: the parting of some Gentle-  
men



men from D. Allen, F. Parsons, Sir Frances Englefield, and the whole body of Catholicks united in certaine affaires of our Countrey: more matters againſt the Seminaries: the writings of G. G. and E. G. againſt D. Allen, F. Parsons and the Ieſuits: the hinderance of D. Allen, when he was to be made Cardinall, and the ſetting up of his emulator: and the breaking forth of all factions againſt the Ieſuits in Rome, Flanders, and England. Now we ſhall come to more domeſticall affaires. And firſt of all we muſt vnderſtand that Fa. Parsons comming to Rome in the yeere 1597, made an end of thoſe ſtirres, which were betweene the Engliſh ſtudents, and the Ieſuits: which we are not here to examine, but referre the Reader to the particuler diſcourſe, which is made thereof. That which concerneth vs here, is the bold and vnſhamefaſt aſſertion, of this Author, who to make a lewd entrance into a like relation, he telleth his Reader that the aſſociation which was begun in England by the Priests, was deuſed by the relicks of the troubleſome, which F. Parsons had after his comming to Rome acquieted. Theſe are his words, *But the relicks of thoſe that had bene troubleſome, and vnquiet before comming into England, and conſerring againe with their conſorts of their former actions, and deſignements fruſtrated as they thought by F. Parsons dealing at Rome, reſolved to begin againe, but after another faſhion, (to wit) by deuſing a certaine new Aſſociation among themſelues, with offices, and prelacies of their owne inſtitution, whereunto meaning to be choſen by voyces of ſuch as they would procure to fauour them, his Holines ſhould be inforced afterward to confirme them, &c.* What is it vpon which this audacious companion will not aduenture, who ſo ſhameleſſy will report a matter controllable by all the Catholicks in England, who can witnes, that this Aſſociation was begunne long before the yeere 1597, and conſequently before Fa. Parsons came to Rome, as may apparantly be gathered out of this place of the Apologie? Yea Fa. Parsons himſelfe (as good prooſe will bee made) had vnderſtanding of this Aſſociation, when he was in Spaine, and M. James Standiſh, who was one of the firſt dealers therein, was at Rome before Fa. Parsons came thither. And could this fellow without a vizard publiſh, that it was deuſed by the relicks of thoſe troubleſome (as hec termeth them) whoſe deſignements were fruſtrated (as they thought) by Fa. Parsons



Parsons *dealing at Rome*? Is it not easily seene with what *spirits assistance* this is written, when as this very same Author in the same booke *Ca.7.fol.89.* turneth this matter to *M. Musb.*, and another vpon his returne from Rome, & the death of the Card. which was in the yeere 1594. and *fol. 90.* bringeth witnes of his owne, that it begun about 4. or 5. yeres before a letter dated the 2. of *May* in the yeere of our Lord 1601? And *fol. 96.* the examination of *Fisher* conuinceth most plainly, that it was begun before his being returned backe out of England in the yeere 1597. as appeareth *fol. 93.* Moreouer, that which here in generall termes he calleth *offices and prelacies of the Priests institution*, in the 7. Chap. *fol. 90.* he calleth a *superioritie*, as it were of *Archbishops*, the one for the South, the other for the North, which if it had bene so, was no *prelacie of these Priests institution*, as all Christendome will witnes. But there was no such matter, as *M. Blackwell* his pen will witnes, which was vsed to proue, how inconuenient it was for one to haue so great a charge: neither can this Author proue, that euer there was any thing intended, but an order or rule, vnder which who would, might liue, and those who would not, might chuse. And there is as much confessed in this *Apologie*, *Cap. 7. fol. 90* where wee finde in the letters of the sixe Assistants to the *Nuntius* in Flanders of the 2. of May 1601, that there were Chapters in the new constitutions of the Association of those that are *to bee admitted, or expelled*; Which is a demonstration that this fellow enlargeth himselfe too farre beyond the trueth in this point, as also when he affirmeth that those *relicks of the troublesome at Rome* deuised a new Association in England with *offices and prelacies of their owne institution*, as if they were *Archbishops*, the one for the North, the other for the South, as *Cap. 7.* he explicateth himselfe, and addeth here in this place a stranger conceit, then was in all the rest, that is, *that his Holines should be inforced afterward to confirme them.* For how this force should be offered to his Holines, we do not vnderstand: especially if it were true (as it is as far from the trueth, as that which we haue already shewed) which *fol. 90.* is said, that this Association was to the preiudice of others. And that the most part of our brethren reclaimed, and misliked the same, as *sauouring both of presumption, and ambition.* But let vs suppose,



pose, as the trueth was, that as many, as were moued in the matter (either Iesuits, or Secular priests) liked so well of it, as some of them affirmed, that the onely feare they had was, that it was too good a motion to goe forward (hauing perchance had some experience of their owne peruerseness, or of others, who now exclaime against it) some that it was the best plot that euer was deuised: yet could not this be any *inforcement to his Holinesse to confirme it*, vnlesse this author will acknowledge such a right in the priests to chuse their superiour, as the thrusting one vpon them, without their priuitie, must bee taken for a wrong done vnto them, which (we hope) he will not say. But we will leaue this fellow to explicate himselfe howe *his Holinesse should haue been enforced to haue confirmed such as the priestes should haue chosent to the offices or prelacies, and as it were Archbishops*, and we will examine that, which followeth, and is peremptorily affirmed, that *the priests were working against the Iesuites, whom* (sayth this author) *they had procured at the very same time by a man sent ouer to this purpose into Flanders, to be accused to his Holinesse in a most odious, and infamous Memoriall, as ambitious men, that will gouerne them against their willes, &c.* But this could neuer be proued as yet against those, who were the beginners of the *association*, although perchance some of those in *Wisbich* might send ouer such informations, as the ambition of Fa. *Weston* the Iesuite, & others his parteners might giue cause in that insolent *Agencie* which was to bee erected in *Wisbich*, whereunto many in England cannot, without a desperate impudencie denie, that both they were solicited, and perswaded, that when they sent their almes to the reliefe of the prisoners in *Wisbich*, all those priests who would not subiect themselues to Fa. *Weston* the Iesuite, should be excluded from hauing any part of their *charity* (as they wrongfully termed it) And one of this godly *Agencie* at *Wisbich* (breaking forth with the consent of the rest, to imploy the vtmost of his talent in this their negotiation) being asked by a Gentleman, with whom he had dealt to this purpose, what should become of those who would not subiect themselues to the Iesuits gouernement, made this answer, *Starue them*. The lamentable diuision which was made by the Iesuits, and their associates in that action, to the pub-



like scandall of all our Countrey, doeth also conuince, that the Iesuites, *as ambitious men, would gouerne the priests against their willes*: there being no other cause of that publike separation both at boord, and in their other conuersation, then the not yeelding of some to become subiects to Fa. *Weston* the Iesuite. By which it appeareth that the *Memorall* in this part was neither *slanderous*, nor any way *false*, as here it is affirmed, but most true and iustificable, and no priest who had any care of his credit, or conscience, could write otherwise to his Holinesse. True it is, that the Iesuites laboured mightily to haue all the priests to set to their hands to certaine letters or propositions framed by them against a *Memorall*, which they themselves spread abroad here in England, and translated it into English, that all sorts of men, women and children might see their goodnesse. And they got many priests to set their hands, some to a letter to this effect, that *upon their owne knowledge all was false, which was contained in the Memorall*: (a testimony, which none but God himselfe could giue; if it had bene so, for it required that such a witnesse was to be present at all times, in all places, with not onely one of those Iesuits, but with them all, in how seuerall, or distant places soeuer they were, and must be priuie to all their actions) others the Iesuits got to set to their hands to this point, that *not knowing any of these articles to be true, they did think that all were false*: An act both of exceeding pride, and rashnes in preiudice of such as were sayd to haue bene the authors of that *Memorall*, to wit, M. D. *Gifford*, and M. *Charles Paget*, and such like, to whome these subscribers & the solicitors were much inferiour for their reputation, and place in the world, and could not without great iniurie (being so informed) giue such a testimony, especially vpon so weake a ground, as *not knowing*: being bound in modestie to know, that there were many things, both true and iustificable, which they did not know, and how easily all malefactours would be cleerely purged from all heinous crimes whatsoeuer, if the witnesse of all, who could not, or would not accuse them, were to bee regarded, or taken as currant, against a farre lesse number of accusers. But neither were these subscriptions voluntarily made: for they were exacted with grieuous comminations and



and threatnings : yea, and some must subscribe without reading that to which they were willed to subscribe, or their subscriptions deferred vntill the time would better suffer the gatherer of the hands, to let the subscriber see, vvhwhereunto he must set his hand : which what could it argue other, then that there was somewhat to be testified, which they, who demanded it, thought in their own consciences, the Priests would not testifie, if they might be suffered to read it? And in this sort was *M. Iohnson* solicited to subscribe, as himselfe did at that verie time relate to some of his brethren. And it is very probable, that *Fa. Garnet* the Iesuit intended some such matter, when writing to *M. Collington* to request him to set his hand to a letter, which *M. D. Bauand* had written, and to procure likewise *M. Charnockes* hand, and *M. Heburnes* to the same, he would not let them see what *M. D. Bauand* had written : but being asked the letter, to which he would haue had these set their names, he returned answere, that it was already sent away : which could argue no other then a fetch to get their consents to subscribe to such a letter, by vertue of which consent, he would haue set their names vnto it, and they should haue testified, they knew not what. The good dealing also in gathering names against this *Memoriall* was presently after shewed, by the falsifying of the Archpriests instructions. For in this heate the authoritie was procured and appointed, as may be prooued by the date thereof, which is 7. *Mart. 1598. Apol. cap. 8 fol 102.* And the first of these testimonials beareth date 24. *Mart. 1598. fol. 98.* *Fa. Garnet* sayling of his purpose, of getting these mens hands in that sort, as he wished ( for although he gaue them libertie to pen a letter of their owne, if they would, yet his request to haue their hands set to a letter already drawen, but not to be seene by them, as the euent prooued when they sent for it, bewrayeth his good meaning what it was : ) there was ( amongst other forged instructions, and falsely inserted among those which were sent vnto the Archp. from Rome ) this instruction made, that euery one should set his hand against that *Memoriall*. And this did the new Archpriest, euen when he was taken in the maner of falsifying his instructions, so vrge vpon *M. Collington* & *M. Charnocke* when he sent for them, to make knowne



his authoritie, as he threatned them grieuouſly, if they would not ſubſcribe againſt it, affirming that they ſhould anſwere this their bearing off from that action, in ſome publike Court, where they ſhould repent it. Afterward alſo it was ſo followed, as *M. Henry Henſlow* was imployed to perſwade them, where *M. Collington* was then reſident, to turne him out of their houſe. And he performed his office with ſuch immodest termes, and with ſuch extreme fury, as he well diſcouered, whereunto this new authoritie did tend. And thus much to ſhew, that it was farre ynough both from *ſlander* and *falſhood*, which was ſaid of the Ieſuites their indeuours, to *gouerne the ſecular Priests againſt their wils*, and how they did canuaſe for names againſt the *Memoriall*, and preſſed the Priests ſo farre, as they were conſtrained to uſe figures (as ſome of them haue ſince confeſſed) to ſatiſfie the importunitie of the Ieſuites and their factours. This alſo is here to be remembred, that the man named to haue bene ſent ouer by the Priests into *Flanders* to accuſe the Ieſuites, was not ſent by them, but returned thither, from whence he was ſent into England, to vnderſtand whether the Ieſuits did uſe themſelues no better in England among the Priests, then they did at Rome among the Engliſh Students: for to this ende he was imployed by the Card. *Toledo* (as he affirmed) and had letters to that effect of the Cardinal, who was much auerſed from the Ieſuits their actions in the College. And although he brought not theſe letters with him into England (which was a cauſe that many giue no credite vnto him) yet he brought ſome teſtimonie thereof, and that he was imployed into England by the Cardinal, and could not returne any other anſwere, then what was moſt apparant by the diuiſion at *Wiſbich*, that the Ieſuites as *ambitious men* would *gouerne the Priests againſt their wils*.

When his Holineſſe ſaw this manner of proceeding, ſaith this author, (that is to ſay, how he ſhould be inforced to confirme theſe Prelates which the Secular priests would haue choſen, and how the Ieſuites were ſlandered and purged by the moſt of the Priests in England) he willed the Card. Protector, to call vnto him *F. Parsons*, and other Engliſhmen in Rome, to ſee what remedie was beſt for theſe diſorders. They anſwered, that the only way which ſeemed good to them was, to giue them a Superior, or Prelate  
of



of their owne Order, and to deliuer thereby the Iesuites from these calumniations, which his Holinesse yeelded vnto, after diuers monethes consultations, &c. Here then we are solicited to conceiue that the ground of this new authoritie, was his Holinesse care to remedy the disorders which he perceiued to be in England, by such letters as were written vnto him: namely against this *Memoriall*, and that after diuers moneths consultation, it was appointed. But we haue already shewed sufficient to prooue this a notorious falshood. For as we haue prooued out of this *Apo. fo. 98* the first letters which were written to this effect, were written the 24 of *March. 1598.* which was after the Cardinals letter of the institution of the Archpriest, as appeareth by the date thereof, which was the seventh of *March, 1598.* as it is to be seene *fol. 102.* and consequently diuers moneths after that his Hol. is said to haue entred into this consultation, as appeareth in this present place of the 1. chap. and in the 8. Chap. *fol. 98.* But perchance we tooke this author at the worst, when we construed his words in this manner, as though he had said, that his Hol. had vpon these letters aduised vpon some subordination, & after diuers moneths resolved vpon this: whereas this author, after mention of these letters, and other matters, sayth only in this sort, *When his Holines sawe this manner of proceeding, he willed the Cardinall, &c.* We are therefore to request the indifferent reader to turn to the 8. cha. of the *Apol.* where no such shift cā be vsed to auoid this foule dealing. The cha. beginneth in this manner. *When his Hol. heard the former state of matters in England Flanders, and other places, and of the murmurations of some against the Fathers of the Societie, set downe aswel in the abouesaid cōtumelious Memoriall, as by diuers other letters & relations, which came to the Protectors sight, and by him was related to his Holines, and namely when he receiued great store of priuate and publicke letters out of England against the said Memoriall of Fisher; and some one, with aboue 100. hands at it, other with 40. and 50. all in fauour and commendation of the Fathers, &c. his Holines after mature deliberation resolved, &c.* And because hee will not come without his prooffe, what cause his Holines had to institute this subordination, or rather to giue order to the Cardinall for it, as hee sayth, hee hath set downe in the margent a note of the letters, which



which caused this consultation. See (sayth he, in the margent) *the letters of the Northerne Priests*, 24. Mart. 1598. and others 20. Apr. and others after 30. Iul and others of the South in great number 18. Maij, and of the quiet sort of Wisbich 27. March 1598. and who without blushing can reade this, and take it as a cause of a determination vpon the 7. of March 1598. for then was the authoritie instituted, as is acknowledged, fol. 102. & much lesse of a consultation diuers moneths before, as is here saide, fol. 7. And thus hee goeth forward with a certaine shamelesse boldnesse, not caring what he sayth, knowing belike that his fauorites will swallow any thing easily, which he proposeth vnto them: yet doeth he too much forget himselfe in this place, where he sayth, that it was not thought expedient for his Holines to write himselfe, for auoiding suspitions and troubles of the state of England: for by this he will sufficiently purge those priests of all disobedience to the Sea Apostolike, who did not subiect themselues to the newe authoritie vpon the comming of the Cardinals letters, by which the authoritie was instituted. But this is elsewhere sufficiently handled, and prooued to be free not onely from *schisme or disobedience*, but from all sinne also, yea though it were true, that his Holines gaue full commission (as here it is saide) to the Card. *Caetane* the Protector, to appoint the authoritie with conuenient instructions. For his Holines not writing himselfe, as here it is cōfessed, how should the Priests take notice thereof, that it was his acte? which, together with the Archpriests misdemeanour, in the promulgation of his new authoritie, & other matters also, was the cause, why the Priests did at their great charges send to Rome two of their brethren, to haue dealt with his Holines about it.

*But their Ambassadors comming thither* (sayth this authour) *and shewing no desire of peace or vnion at all, or to accept of any good condition to liue in obedience, &c.* And thus hee runneth with a free penne to auouch any thing which is for his purpose, how contrary soeuer it is to trueth. But because this matter is at large handled by this author in the 9. Chapter of the *Apologie*, where also we shall declare how these matters passed at Rome, we will onely note here, that the two Priests had little reason to determine their businesse with F. Parsons, D. Haddocke, or M.

*Martin*



*Martin Array*, who perchance are the *others* which are here meant, and as it is here confessed fol. 99. were actors or consultors in the constitution of this authority, and parties directly opposite against the Priests in England. Besides that, the condition which was offered by *F. Parsons*, was very ridiculous, to wit, that the two Priests, who with so great danger and charge were arrived at Rome in the behalfe of many other, should returne againe into England with letters to the Archpriest and Iesuits, *to amend what should be yeelded by them to haue beene done amisse: & to giue satisfaction vnto all men, where it was due:* which if the Archpriest and Iesuites would not performe, the Priests might come againe out of England to Rome. And how sub- till soeuer *F. Parsons* thought himselfe in this deuise, the two priests could not but thinke it would haue bene a great folly in them, to haue accepted this condition of peace, although perchance if they had vnderstood his Holines mind, that he would haue entertained them, as they were entertained, with close imprisonment, and other such fauours (as shalbe shewed as occasion serueth) possibly they might haue returned againe into their countrey, and haue contented themselues vntill it had pleased God, to haue taken some pitie vpon their miseries. But to prooue how falsly this fellow affirmeth, that *the two Priests shewed no desire of peace and vnion*, their going to the Cardinall *Caietane* (whome they tooke to be the ordeiner of the new authoritie, as these words of his letters did import) *Dum hac nostra ordinatio durauerit: so long as this our ordinance shall endure:* and there offer to bring him in writing, what they had to say, will be a sufficient argument: which as it should seeme, the Iesuites, and their faction, fearing least by this meanes their dealings might come to light, procured (contrary to the Cardinals honour, who had entertained the Priestes in this cause) that they should be committed close prisoners, & not suffered euer after to come together to deale in any thing, vntill some two or three dayes after, that there was a *Breue* giuen, in confirmation of the Archpriests authoritie: which being obtained vpon the 6. of *Aprill*, as the *Breue* beareth date, the two Priests were suffered vpon the 8. of the same moneth to come together, & the *Breue* being presently brought vnto them, they yeelded.



yeelded themselves, as well in the name of their brethren, as in their own, promising to obey it, & doubtles were ready enough to haue sworne it, if his Holines had exacted any such thing at their hands, after that he had declared what his wil was should be done, what reason soeuer the priests had to the contrarie. But the trueth is, that there was no oath taken, nor any demanded. This might therefore haue been left out with more truth then inserted in this *Apologie*, to wit: *this was promised at that time of all hands, and the two messengers did sweare it also by a corporall oath*: as also that epitheton to the *Breue*, to wit, *new*: for what doth this import other, then another *Breue*, as though some *Breue* had been before made, and refused by the priests? which is a most vntrue conceit, yet necessarily to be made vpon these words of the *Apology*, *He (the Pope) confirmed all that was done already by the Cardinal with a new Breue. This was promised at that time* (sayth this author) *of all hands, and the two messengers did sweare also by a corporall oath, and hope was, that all would be quiet hereupon, to which effect Fa. Parsons also wrote very courteous and pious letters vnto M. Collington, and M. Mush, and they accepted kindly of the same, as after wee shall haue occasion perhaps more particularly to set downe. But now Sathan being loth to haue sedition ended, began again to set them out in England, and to put them in worse case then euer, by the industry of certaine seditious humors of the chiefeft contenders, whereof some deuised newe iniuries offered them by the quiet, some required satisfaction for the old &c. untill in Nouember last 1600. diuers of the discontented made a generall appeale &c.*

Thus farre doth he imbolden himselfe, as who hauing no intention to bee any way accounted a changeling. Wee will here omit, that which he affirmeth of *Fa. Parsons pious letters to M. Collington, and M. Mush*, which seeme here to haue been written vpon the *promises and oath* (as he sayth) *of the messengers*, to be at peace, when they saw the Popes *Breue*, which letters *Cap. 10 fol. 143.* hee saith were written *euen then* (to vse his owne words) *when yet the Popes Breue was not come forth, as appeareth, for that this was written the ninth of April, and the Breue beareth date of the 21. of the same moneth.* What neede was there of this so palpable a falshood? Cannot *Fa. Parsons* praises euen in  
matte:s



matters of ſmalleſt moment be ſounded by lip, or regiſtered by pen, but with moſt groſſe falſhood, *thus wrote F. P.* (that is, a courteous and pious letter, as here it is declared *fol. 8.* for it beareth the ſame date, and is written to the ſame men as may be ſcene) *even then when yet the Popes Breue was not come forth.* And leſt any man ſhould doubt of this *Fa. Parsons* his courteſie or pietie, before that time of the comming forth of the *Breue*, he proueth it by the date of his letters which he ſayth is the ninth of *April*, and the date of the *Breue* which he ſayth is the 21. of *April*. A manifeſt falſhood, as may bee ſcene both by the *Breue* it ſelfe, and by many places in this *Apologie*: where it is ſet downe to beare date 6. *April* 1599, as in the ſame tenth chapter *fol. 140*: and immediatly before in the end of the ninth chapter, and els where. So that I cannot but marueile at the fooliſh greedines of this author, in taking euery occaſion to commend *Fa. Parsons*, how vntowardly ſo euer it ſadgeth with him. But *Sathan* being loth to haue ſedition ended, began againe to ſet them out in *England*, and to put them in worſe caſe, then euer, by the induſtry of certaine ſeditious humors of the chiefeſt contenders &c. Theſe were the Ieſuits and the Archpriſt: firſt the Ieſuits, namely *Fa. Iacob*, who after the peace made, gaue out, that they, who ſhould hold opinion *dogmatizando*, that the prieſts were not *ſchisma- tikes*, ſhould incurre the cenſures of holy Church, which the Archpriſt did not onely not controll being told thereof, but bare the Ieſuit out in his wicked aſſertion. And furthermore publiſhed a reſolution, which he ſayd hee had receiued from the mother citie, by which the prieſts were condemned, as *ſchisma- tikes*. and it was high time for the prieſts not onely to complaine of intolerable iniuries, but to ſeeke for ſatiſfaction alſo in ſuch places, where they were by theſe meanes defamed, which when it would not be granted, they made an offer to come to diſpute the caſe, with promiſe moſt humbly to aſke pardon of the Archpriſt, and the Ieſuits, if it could be proued, that they had been *ſchisma- tikes*, and deſire to be reſtored to their good name, if in caſe they could not be proued to haue been ſuch. But this offer of diſpute was alſo reieſted, and they were threatned, who ſhould goe about to defend their good names, thus moſt vniuſtly harmed. whereupon they ſent to the Vni-  
N
uerſitie



uerſitie of *Paris*, that by the reſolution of learned men, ſuch as they imagined a company of punie felowes would haue regarded, this queſtion might haue bene ended. But when theſe filly men ſaw this reſolution for the prieſts, they were worſe then euer they were, and the Archprieſt did forbid all ſorts vpon grieuous penalties to maintain *that reſolution by word, or writing, directly, or indirectly, whether it were giuen vpon true information, or otherwiſe.* as though thoſe learned men hauing true information (as the Archprieſt here ſuppoſed) were ſo much to be contemned, as no man without incurring grieuous cenſures, might defend their opinion, in the queſtion propoſed: for theſe are the words of the decree, made by the Archprieſt 29. *May* 1600 *whether it be truely giuen, or forged, whether vpon true information, or otherwiſe.* And theſe proceedings of the Archprieſt compelled the prieſts to make their Appeale to his Holines, which beareth date the 17 of *November* 1600. And it was made not onely for them who ſet their names vnto it, but for others alſo, who ſeeing the affliction which hung ouer the ſecular prieſts, and fearing (not without iuſt cauſe) that their turne would come afterward, were deſirous of redreſſe, but dared not to ſhew themſelues in the action, in reſpect of the hard meaſure which they ſaw offered to their brethren, who were in actuall perſecution by the Ieſuits, and Archprieſt. And when this *Apologie* was publiſhed in England, it was knowen, that long before the publiſhing thereof, the prieſts were gone ouer to proſecute their Appeale; and had preſented themſelues before the *Nuntius* in Flanders, who was in commiſſion, as they vnderſtood, to determine this matter.

And whereas it may be ſayd, that the booke was printed, before thus much was knowen, this anſwere alſo may be made, that in the like caſe, where an vntrueth was printed in the 12. Chapter *fol. 201.* they did find a meanes to clap on a piece of paper, that it ſhould not bee read, being a relation no more falſe, then this was. But if they ſhould haue taken this courſe throughout the booke, to haue paſted paper, where there were vntrueths vttered, there would haue been very little to haue read in the *Apologie*. And therefore perchance they reſolued rather to aduenture all their credit at once, by letting  
the



the booke goe vncorrected of those falshoods, which are contained in it, then not to do the harme which they intended. The like folly and falshood also is that, which is here inserted of M. *Charnocks* Appeale: for as we had sufficient testimony from beyond the seas, his Appeale was prosecuted in due time: and moreouer, that he was long since freed from the sentence of the two Cardinals.

And wheras it is furthermore sayd, that M. *Charnocke* appealed frō the sentence of two Cardinals, after that he had accepted it, and sworne to the obseruation thereof, it is most vntrue; for no oath was euer demanded of him, concerning that sentence. It was onely shewed by Fa. *Parsons* first to him, and afterward to M. *Bishop*, who had his liberty foure or fūe dayes before this sentence was seen. And all the oathes, which were taken, were taken by *Acarisius* the Fiscall, when M. *Bishop* was deliuered out of prison: which acte of the *Fiscals* was of none effect, as not hauing Commission to do any thing in that cause, as Fa. *Parsons* affirmed, when hee shewed this sentence of the Cardinals, alleaging for prooffe, out of the same letters, that the declaration of the Cardinals mind was committed to the Rector, or Vicerector of the English Colledge. But of these matters, and the falshood vsed therein, we shall haue occasion to write more at large in answer to the ninth chapt. And while these Appeales did and doe hang, all obedience is shewed, which may bee shewed without preiudice of the Appeale, or which is to be vsed to notorious detractors, and vnconscionable defamers of Catholike priests. Neither is there any other libertie, or freedome sought for by any, then such liberty as belongeth to Christians, and of the which Catholike priests are most vnchristianly depriued, and they onely seeke to liue in reputation due vnto their estates, and to maintaine the same by all lawfull meanes. How falsly also this is inserted by this author, that *liberty* is sought, and *not triall of the cause*, I commit to the iudgement of all men of any sence, who vnderstand how that the priests are gone to Rome to his Holines, to haue the case decided. *But nor resting here, nor contented with this freedome during the dependance of the sayd Appeales, they haue proceeded* (sayth this author) *to greater disorders, which is, to publish in*  
N 2
print



## A Reply to a Lib.called

*print most iniurious contumelious, and infamatory bookes, and libels, (as before hath bene sayd) without particular name of author, without licence of Superiour, and other circumstances of modesty, right, and conscience required in such attempts, &c.*

This good fellow presumeth much of his readers ignorance, fauour or patience. For, as it appeareth by the Archpr. his letters to *M. Collinton*, he reiected the appeale, & by other his acts he hath declared, that those, who had put their names vnto it, had incurred the penalties of his decrees. He also hereupon solicited some not to receiue the Sacraments at the appellants hands, as may appeare by his letter of the 16. of April 1601. to a gentleman, where thus he writeth, *This I write to make you priuie of the great spirituall danger, wherein you and all that receiue any Sacraments of M. Oswald Needam may be, if it be so, that he hath subscribed vnto a seditious pamphlet, coloured with the name of an appeale.* With what face then doth this fellow, in the Archpriests behalfe, vrge the dependance of the appeale? or what freedome is that, with which hee would that the appellants should haue bene contented? if there was iust cause to appeale, in what a poore case would the Archpriest bee, if that there were put in execution against him, which is due vnto the refusers of iust appeales, and contemners of the sea Apostolike, whither the appeale was made? And if the appeale were not a iust appeale, how foolishly is it here vrged, *that the Priests not resting here, nor contented with this freedome, during the dependance of the same appeales, they haue proceeded to greater disorders? which is to publish in print most iniurious, contumelious, and infamatory bookes, and libels, without particuler name of Author, without licence of superior, &c.* The causes of this publishing haue bene diuersly touched by many, who haue proued, that it was most necessary, for the procuring of an vnfeined peace, lest matters being shuffled vp, as once before they were, the Iesuits should breake out at their pleasure (as they did once before, not long after the peace was concluded) And being backed with the authoritie of the Archpriest, bring new quarels euery day worse, and more grieuous, then the former. And whereas here it is particularly vrged, *that during the dependance of the appeales these bookes were published,* it is easily answered, because the archpriest shewed no reuerence



uerence to his Holines, and to the sea Apostolicke, but denied the dimissory letters, which were demanded of him, reiected the appeale, as a *seditions pamphlet*, and proceeded against the appellants, as if the appeale were no otherwise to be esteemed: as wee haue immediatly before proued, and all Catholicks can testifie as much, who haue bene warned not onely from receiuing Sacraments of the appellants, but also from being present at their sacrifice, because they set their hands to that appeale. And therefore it was iudged necessary, that all Catholicks should be informed of the trueth, and how the case stood in this present controuersie, which, without printing, could not conueniently haue bene declared, especially where the matter is so hardly followed, that no one of the Priests may bee suffered to speake for themselues. And to this effect also were the *Latine* bookes printed, that the Priests making their cause generally knownen in Christendome, they might (maugre their aduersaries) come to haue audience, where they desired, and had once before failed: when, for auoyding of too much speech of strangers, they went in a more priuate sort for a remedy of home miseries. Neither ought any man to wonder at this good fellow, when he calleth these bookes *Libels*: for the spirit moued him in hope at that time, that the Priests should be sufficiently debarred from comming to the place, where now they are, and being there ready to proue such things, as are here to be objected, they doe conuince the vnderstanding of him, who hath any, and knoweth what belongeth to a libel, that these bookes are no *Libels*, against which this author inueyeth in these hote termes, *iniurious, contumelious, and infamatory bookes or libels*. But by that which followeth, he doeth more discouer his folly. He saith, that the bookes were published *in print, without particuler name of Author, without licence of superior, and other circumstances of modestie, right, and conscience required in such attempts*. Alas good sir, to omit in this place, what want there is of other circumstances of modestie, throughout all the *Apologie*, if it be a necessary circumstance of modestie, right, and conscience, to put to a booke some particuler name of Author, where was your modestie, right, and conscience, when you published this *Apologie*? what particuler name of Author hath your booke? Haue you not set it



out in these general termes *written and set forth by Priests united in due subordination to the right reverend Archpriest, and other their superiors?* And I pray you (sir) what *particular name* is here, and of what author? Good sir turne once againe the bookes against which this *Apologie* is written: and finde this circumstance of *modestie, right, or conscience* more wanting in their bookes, then in the *Apologie*, and then with lesse shame vpbraid the priests that they published *in print without particular name of Author, and other circumstances of modestie, right, and conscience.*

But to giue a fuller satisfaction to our Reader, We affirme that the books which were published by the Priests, were published with more *particular name of authour*, then this *Apologie* was, if the *particular name* be that which bringeth the authour to be knowen who he was. For first the *Latine* booke, which was published in print, and dedicated to his Holinesse, is sayd to be *exhibited by those Priests who were accused of Schisme, and other crimes.* The English booke also which is intituled, *The copies of certaine discourses*, carieth as *particular a name of authour*, in these words, *which were extorted from diuers, as their friends desired them, or their aduersaries driue them to purge themselves of the most grievous crimes of schisme, sedition, rebellion, faction and such like.* Now good sir, I doe appeale to the indifferent Reader, whether the authors of these two books (for this *Apologie* meaneth none other, as appeareth by the whole discourse thereof, and particularly fol. 8.) were more knowen by this description *accused of schisme* (they shewing themselves publiquely in their owne defence) then the authors of the *Apologie* by this description, *Priests united in due subordination to the Archpriest*, all the rest keeping their consciences to themselves, that no man almost is sure, who can be meant by this name. And some of them, who were so firmly reputed for such, as the Archpriest and Iesuites aduentured to aske their handes or consents to somewhat, which some doe thinke should haue bene vsed, for the authorizing or giuing their consents to the setting out of this booke, they tooke this priestlike courage vnto them, as to deny to set their hands to that, to which they were not to be made priuie. And many more there are (as many doe knowe) who goe for such as are here set downe for authours of this *Apologie,*



*pologie*, who perchance haue their handes as deepe in the answer, as any of the other. But we will let this slip go, hoping that this good fellow will be better aduised in his next booke, how he taxeth men for that, in which he doth offend himselfe, if the fault which hee findeth may be called an offence. But now concerning the other circumstance, that the bookes were printed *without licence of Superiour*. If this authour will tell vs, whither we should haue gone neere hand to haue found an indifferent *Superior*, we will acknowledge that there was some error. The Archpriest was not an indifferent *Superiour* in this case, because he was a partie, against whom the bookes were to be published so farre foorth as they concerned the controuerisie betweene himselfe and the Priests, and therefore he was not likely to giue them licence to print. An other *Superior* they know not where to seeke in any reasonable distance, to demaund their *licence*. Besides that, to their remembrance, they doe not finde any authority in his Commission, to *licence* bookes to the print being no *Ordinarie*, but a *Subdelegate*, and for certaine purposes, among which this is not reckoned for any. And perchance this was the cause, why being sollicitied by M. Collington vpon the comming foorth of the *Apologie*, to certifie him what *Superiours* did *licence* the printing thereof, he knewe not what to answer. And if these words, *permisso superiorum*, bee prooued a necessary *circumstance of modestie*, they shall be vsed hereafter in our books also: Much idle stuffe followeth to make an end of this chapter, as that *the Priests doe goe about to disguise matters by laying the fault vpon M. Archpriest and Fa. Parsons, as though they did not descend to such particulars, as cannot be applyed vnto any other, but vnto them. They labour to purge themselves from schisme, in their forbearing to obey the authoritie appointed by his Holinesse, before they did see some instrument from his Holinesse, in testimony that he had instituted, or giuen authoritie to another, for the institution thereof. They complaine of hard dealing vsed towards the students, and particularly against the two Priests, who were not suffered to come to his Holinesse, being sent vnto him to deale concerning this new authoritie. And whereas the Priests are here charged to contemne the Cardinall Farnesius his doing, or writing, or procuring for the Archpriest a Protonotari<sup>ship</sup>:*

This



This fellow seemeth to take it for a disgrace, not to make some sport among all his big words. For how would a man thinke, that he prooueth this *negligence* or *contempe*, as he tearmeth it? Forsooth the Cardinall procured the Archpriest to be *protonotarius apostolicus*. And what then? doeth it follow, that the priests doe *neglect* and *contemne*, whatsoeuer the present *Protector*, Cardinall *Farnesius* hath done or written, or deferred to the Archpriest, because the Cardinall procured him to be a Notarie? But perchance the booke is falsely printed, and that which followeth, as another *contempt*, is to be vnderstood to be the onely prooffe of the *contempt*, of which here is mention. These are the words, *Neither doe they giue him the title of Reuerendissimus due to that degree, and used towards him by the Cardinall himselfe in his letters.* We will leaue it to this author to explicate himselfe, whether this word *neither* implieth a second or one onely *contempt*. We will onely excuse the Priestes for not giuing him the title of *Reuerendissimus*, vntill they did know some cause why. For as it is to be supposed, the priests did not see, what Cardinall *Farnesius* writ vnto M. *Blackwell*. Neither yet haue they seene any thing, why he may not challenge to be called *Illustrissimus*. And yet, I thinke, it were a wonderfull folly, if they should giue him that title, and he could not but take it as a flout, or a mocke to be so called. The reason then being all one, the Priestes knowing no more of the one, then of the other, it is an argument, that this authour wanted both matter, and wit to deuise matter. For who would haue vsed so great termes against priests, for not giuing a title to one, to whom a Cardinall gaue it in a priuate letter? In what feare may we be stricken, least that some Cardinall had also written to this authour, and giuen him some title, which we know not? Or if any Cardinall would bestow any honest title vpon him, yet this kind of *Reuerendissimiship*, being a matter of twenty or forty crownes, he might easily procure it: and wee might be condemned for *neglecting* or *contemning* somewhat, which is not in vse, where as skilfull *Protonotaries*, as any are in England do keepe open shops in euery good towne, and are known amongst their honest neighbours for such. But we will let this idle exception go, among the other, as idle & railing speeches,

with



with which this authour endeth the first chapter, and closeth vp his readers stomacke with them, who cannot but see what spirit, and in what sort it mooueth him.

C H A P. 7.

*How this Author of the Apologie while hee would inueigh against dangerous and temerarious propositions, engageth himselfe further then becommeth a Catholike. Apol. c.2.*

**I**N the second Chapter of the *Apologie*, this Author purposeth to treat of three things: first, of disobedience: secondly, of vndutifull behanour to superiours, namely his Holines: thirdly, of scandalous and temerarious propositions.

Concerning the first, he bringeth some Scriptures, with *ifs* and *ands*: as if his reader should prouide himselfe to heare of a great plumpe: *If all this be so as it is* (sayth he) *alas in what case, &c.* And so proceedeth to a lamentation ouer his brethren, supposing that the scriptures he brought were as truly applied, as they were true in themselues. And to prooue the stubbornesse in the Priests, which the good man seemeth to lament, he bringeth a clause (as he tearmeth it) of a letter of Card. Allen to M. Mush, dated the 16. of March 1594. whereby he would haue his reader conceiue very strange matters, and wrongfully informed himselfe of any euill affection or hard opinion of the Cardinall towards the Secular priests. And lest wee should be thought to blame this authors folly without cause, wee will set downe his owne words as they lie after his *exordium*, together with the Cardinals letter. These are his words.

*For first of all to begin with Cardinall Allen, of whom these men would seeme to make most account now he is dead & gone, as though he had fauoured them when he was alieue, which yet (as we shall shew) is quite contrary: for he in his foresaid letter of the 16. of March to M. Mush, doth most earnestly giue in charge to him and to all other Priests, to liue in great vnion with the Fathers of the Society, yeelding for his reason the singular obligation they had to their manifold benefits. His words are these: I haue heard (sayth hee) to my great*  
*griefe,*



*griefe, that there is not that good correspondence betweene the Fathers and other priests. I cannot tell vpon what discontentment, &c. But whereof soeuer it commeth, it is of the enemye, and with all possible discretion and diligence by the wiser sort on both sides to be rooted out, or els it wil be the ruine of the whole cause, &c. Therefore in this point especially (M. Mush) be earnest and peremptory with all parties, and euery one in particular. And tell them, that I charge and aduise them by the blessed blood and bowels of Gods mercie, that they honour, loue, and esteeme one another according to euery mans age, order, and profession: and that those of the Secular order, especially those that haue bene brought up vnder the Fathers, and haue found so great loue, charity, and helpe in all places at their hands, that they be correspondent in all gratitude and thankfulnessse, reuerencing them in word and deed, as is requisite to their merits and calling, &c. Thus wrote the good Cardinall not aboue halfe a yeere before his death. And by this we see, both what his loue & opinion was towards the Fathers, and what his commandement and order was to all those priests, he being superiour to them all, appointed by his Holinesse, that now are so contentious against the Iesuits. What would the good man haue said, if hee had liued till this day, to see his request and commandement so contemned by them? And how can M. Mush and others name so often the Cardinall without blushing, when they breake so earnest an exhortation, and order of his in so great a matter?*

The contents in this letter are so plaine, as I cannot but marueile at this fellow his boldnesse, and how without blushing he can make that descant which here he doeth.

The letter (as all men may see) was written vpon a suggestion made vnto the Cardinall, that the Priests and Iesuites were dangerously fallen out, as may appeare by those words, *I cannot tell vpon what discontentment.* And afterward, *Therefore in this point especially (M. Mush) be earnest and peremptory with all parties, and euery one in particular.* Thirdly the charge and aduise which was giuen, was as deeply giuen to the Iesuits as to the Priests, as may appeare by the wordes immediatly following those which we last cited: *And tell them that I charge and aduise them, by the blessed blood and bowels of Gods mercie, that they honour, loue, and esteeme one another, according to euery mans age, order, and profession.* Fourthly, the particular exhortation to the  
 Secular



Secular priests to be *correspondent in all gratitude and thankfulness* to the Iesuits loue, charitie, and helpe, with reuerence in word and deed, not only as was requisite, but as was about their merits and calling, was long since preuented, as appeareth by a letter of F. *Campion* to F. *Euerard* the generall of the societie (with whome there was no cause why hee should dissemble) as may be seene in the *Epistle of pious grieffe*, fol. 6. & 7. These are his words there cited: *Tanta est aestimatio, quam de nobis concitarunt Presbyteri, ipsi etiam piissimi, & doctissimi, ut nisi timide commemorandum sentiam: The Priests here, who are most learned and holy, haue raised such an opinion of vs, as I cannot speake it without feare: which saying of F. Campion* proouing nothing but a *correspondence in all gratitude* on the behalfe of the priests for the loue, charitie, and helpe, which they had or might haue of the *Fathers*, I cannot but wonder at the *Epistle-maker*, who bringeth it to prooue a *correspondence* in the behalfe of the Iesuits, vnlesse perchance he meane, that no other *gratitude* is to be expected of a Iesuite, then that he will tell his generall, what benefits he receiueth. This *correspondence* of the Priests was so followed still by them, vntill the Iesuits grewe so insolent, as those, who brought them into credit, were forced to stand at their reuer- sion, and without respect either to age, order, or profession, they went about tyrannically to haue the gouernment ouer the Priests, as may be prooued as well by their attempt at *Wibich*, as by the beginnings abroad, where Catholikes had no enter- tainment for Priests of what age, order, or profession soeuer, vnlesse they did come by order of a Iesuite, and so would the Cardinal haue said, if he might haue liued till this day: notwithstanding his request and commaundement giuen as well vnto the Secular Priests as Iesuits, in these words: *Tell them, that I charge and ad- uise them by the blessed blood and bowels of Gods mercy, that they ho- nour, loue, and esteeme one another according to euery mans age, or- der, and profession: yet this fellow, without blushing, citeth this letter to prooue the Cardinals more speciall affection before his death to the Iesuits, then vnto the Priests, wherein he giueth a like round charge to them both: and in that hee gaue this commission to a Secular priest, to be peremptory with all parties, this letter doeth rather prooue, that hee fauoured the Secular*

O 2

priests,



priests then the Iesuits. And thus much concerning those fond collections which are made out of this letter by the author of this *Apologie*.

Our author hauing shewed (as he supposeth) that the priests haue disobeyed this the Cardinall *Allen* his commandement, (whereas indeed the Iesuits did breake it, and draue the priests to stand vpon their owne necessarie defence) he pretendeth to shew the priests their *progresse from worse to worse*: but in verie deed discouereth his owne in the same kind. And first he outrunneth his reader, by briefly touching (but vntruly, as will be shewed in the particular treatise of the *Romane stirs*) the breaking forth of the students in Rome with the Iesuites: and as if his words were *Oracles*, hee applyeth some places of Scripture (as he knoweth who did to our Sauiour in the desert) then hee pursueth his former confuted falshood, of the beginning of *new associations* in England, after the aforesaid tumults ended in Rome, & telleth his reader that his Holines perceiuing the same *to tend to a new diuision and contention, as well by the lawes and rules thereof, as by a certaine new, contumelious, and most enormous Memoriall, sent ouer against the Iesuits, hee appointed them* (the priests) *a superiour of their owne order, as you haue heard, and such an one, as their owne two ambassadours sent to Rome, confessed vnder their owne hands and othes (as appeareth in their examinations) that he had bene the likeliest man of al others to be chosen by voices, if the election had bene permitted vnto them.* And so he goeth on without any newe matter, or any thing that needeth newe answer: only this we are to note (for so much as we can learne) that neither of those two Priests (whom here he calleth *the two ambassadours*) did euer say or sweare so much, as here they are charged: neither can it be *prooued out of their examinations*, vnlesse the Iesuits haue shewed their skill in corrupting, or falsifying those examinations, as they haue done in other writings. The challenge also which followeth, that *the Priests did not obey the Archpriest at the sight of the Cardinall Caietans letters*, is often, but now lately by *M. Collington* sufficiently answered. And if the Cardinall had vpon his owne proper motion, expected an absolute *blind obedience* vnto him, it had argued too great a want of consideration in him.

There



There is also a full satisfaction giuen, that what the priestes did, might very wel stand with *obedience*, and with *humility*, and was not against any *oath* which any tooke, when they were schollers of the Seminaries: that *oath* being no other, then to take orders, when the superiour would haue them, and to returne into England, when they should be sent, *ad lucrandas animas: to gaine soules to God*: which they did performe vntill this new authority, pretending power to take away their faculties (by which they laboured in their vocation) *solo nutu* (to vse M. Blackwells words to M Charnock, in his letters 17. Iunij 1600.) *at his becke* did make them cease (for scandall sake) to doe that, to which by oath they were bound. By which it may appeare how foolishly this *oath* of the Seminaries is vrged, against those, who did not become *blind obedient* at the sight of the Cardinals letter to M Blackwell. And if any haue since promised obedience to the Archpriest, when they receiued their faculties, they are ready to giue a reasonable cause, why in such and such particulars they did not obey him. For as I take it, this fellow will not stand obstinately in this heresie, *that a superior cannot doe any thing, or command any thing amisse, wherein a subiect may refuse to obey him*, although he were sworne to obey him, as now many are. For such oathes are alwayes to be vnderstood, to be obserued in iust and lawfull matters, or at the most in such, as are not to bee prooued most vniust, and vnlawfull, as these are, which the Archpriest doth command, to wit: that they shal not defend themselues, nor be defended of other from the infamie of *schisme, sedition, faction, rebellion* and such like, whereof they know themselues to be most cleere, and that the suffering of such slanders to goe vncontrolled, would bee most iniurious to themselues, preiudiciall to Gods Church, in which they liue as pastors, and dishonorable to God himselfe, to whose seruice they haue, with their vttermost peril, deuoted themselues. But to make all apparant in one word: the priests obeyed so soone as they knew it to be his Holinesse will, that it should be so, as appeareth by the second Breue, dated 17. August 1601. if there were no other profe for it. These are the words of the Breue: *Quæ nostræ literæ, simul atq; promulgatæ ad vestram (filij presbyteri) notitiâ deuenerunt, omnem illico sedatam fuisse discordiam,*



## A Reply to a Lib. called

*diam, & summam pacem (reconciliata inter vos gratia, depositisq; odijs, & simulatibus) initam fuisse, magno nostro cum gaudio cognovimus: Which letters of ours (the Breue) so soone as they were promulged, and came to your knowledge, we perceiue to our great ioy, that all discord was presently appeased, and that a full peace was made by a mutuall atonement, and a laying apart all hatred, and priuate grudge. So that we doe not a little marueile at this fellow his boldnes, who without any regarde of so many testimonies, as would be brought against him, or of this Breue, would set forth to the view of the world this vntrueth, concerning the priests obedience at the sight of the Breue, to induce his Reader to a contrary conceit of the priests actions. For thus he telleth his tale: But at length his Holinesse to resolute all doubts declared by his Breue, that all, and euery point of the former institution by the Cardinall was by his order, consent, knowledge and commandement, and should not this haue brought some remorse to good and tender consciences, of all the broyles, and turmoiles raised up before about this vnecessary doubt? Or at least wise should not this haue so appeased men for the time to come, as that whatsoever the superiour had bene for his person, yet should his authority neuer more haue bene called in question? But what ensued? Truly we are afraid to recount it, remembering that dreadfull saying of the Apostle, Mali autem homines proficiunt in peius. Euill men shal goe from worse to worse. And it seemeth to haue come to passe, for that diuers of these chiefe heads of this seditio, seeming to haue lost much of Gods grace, in not obeying promptly that Apostolicall declaration, & determination, haue run since to farre greater contempt, and perturbation of mind &c. Could this fellow haue vsed himselfe more malapertly against the Popes Breue, then after his wonted and graceles conceits and insinuations, to tell his reader that the Priests did not promptly obey that apostolicall declaration, whereas the words of the Breue are most plaine to the contrary, *Qua nostra litera simulatq; promulgata ad vestram (filij presbyteri) noticiam deuenerunt, omnem ilico sedatam fuisse discordiam, &c.* So soone as our Breue came to your viewe, presently all discord was appeased, and peace was made &c. which peace is in diuers discourles shewed to haue been broken by the Archpriest, when complaint being made vnto him by the priests, of that audaciousnesse of Fa. Iones the Iesuite,*



Iesuite, in renewing his fellow *Fa. Listers* absurd, and seditious assertion of *schisme* against the priests, hee did not onely avouch asmuch now a fresh, but published a *resolution*, which he sayd hee had receiued from Rome, to the same effect: and with such appurtenances as might well declare how deepe a roote the infection had taken.

The other two points, to wit, of *undutifulnes* and of *scandalous & temerarious propositions*, are handled somewhat confusedly: But for the fuller satisfaction of the Reader, they shalbe answered as they lie. And whereas this author doeth first begin to except against some speeches, vttered by letters, contained in the English booke, as cōtemptuously spoken of the dignity, and office of the Archpriest, and also of the maner of the institution thereof by his Hol. the reader is to vnderstand, that in this there is very euil dealing, cōsidering that those speeches, which were vsed, were vsed before it was knowen, that his Holines had his finger in it. And they were the more boldly vsed, because it was presumed, that the authority was not instituted by his Holines, but by the Cardinall *Caietane*, who in his letter constitutive affirmeth, that *this was his owne ordinance*: although hee saith in one place in generall termes, that he *was commanded to make a peace in England* vpon the false suggestion, that the priests and Catholiks were at warres. And in another place that *hee followed the Popes will*, who thought it meet that there should be a *subordination* in England, being induced thereunto by reason giuen him by priests: whereas to this day neither were the reasons euer heard, nor what priests they were who gaue them, except perchance a few Iesuits, who are exempted frō the authoritie. Nothing then being knowen to the contrary, but that it was a deuise of the Iesuits, and an institution of the Card. *Caietane* by their meanes, without any letters to one effect, or other from his Holines, as is here confessed in this *Apol. Cap. 1 fol. 7.* the priests might the more iustly terme the authority by such names, as to them it seemed then to deserue, to wit a *new, and extraordinary authority vnpleasing, obtruded, disorderly procured gouernment, exorbitant and altogether dissonant from reason, & the accustomed practise of Gods Church, and that it was already thought by the Councell, to bee of purpose erected, not for Religion, but for the better*



*better effecting of plots and designments of State.* For although neither the title of an Archpriest be *new*, nor the authoritie of an Archpr *extraordinary*, yet may this authoritie be termed both *new* and *extraordinary* being such as was neuer heard of, to haue bene before giuen to so meane a Prelate. It was called an *unpleasing authority*, for that it was meerely affectiue, as may appeare by the constitutiue letters: and if it haue now any power to do any good to any, the Prelate is to giue thanks for such thanks for such his authority to those priests, who found the fault. It was said to be *obtruded*, for that neither the priests knew, that it came by any lawfull authority, nor it selte brought any gratefull thing with it, but rather did grace and strengthen the faction of the Iesuits against them, the Archpr. being cōmanded in his instructions to doe nothing of moment, without the aduise of the Iesuits, who had already begun a most scandalous sedition in England. It was said to be *disorderly procured &c.* both in respect of the false suggestion, which was the mother thereof, (as may appeare by the constitutiue letter) and also in respect that the principall actors in the procuring thereof were men of an other order, who were not onely free frō being subiect vnto it, but must be directors also in it, especially in matters of moment, as appeareth by the Archpr. his 6 instruction. All which maner of proceeding being right well knowen, and that these principall procurers, and counsellors were such, as were also knowen to the Counsell to be more meddling in matters of State, then became them, they could not shoot very wide, who affirmed that this authority was already thought by her Maiesties Councell to be of purpose erected, for the better effecting of such designments. Neither was this to bring the archpr. or any good Cath. that should obey him, within the compasse of treason, for matter of State: but a reason which al good Catholikes might take, why the priests were not euer forward, to run after the noueltie, hauing no other warrant for it, then a letter of a Cardinall, who vnder colour of pietie might easily be carried by the Iesuits (known Statesmen) to do any thing, which might further their designments. And the Counsel being knowen to be thus possessed, the priests had no reason to runne further into displeasure of her Maiestie, & her Hon. Councell: but  
rather



rather seeke to be well assured, that the ground thereof was no State plot, but Religion, for which they haue bene, and are most ready to shed their blood, when it shall please God to suffer it. But where doeth this good fellow shew, that the priests would bring all good Catholikes, that should obey the ordination, & the Archpriest, within the compasse of treason for matter of State? See I pray you how he choppeth Logike: which point these men, to worke more mischief, do teach the persecutors in plaine words: againe a litle after in the same page in these words. Besides all this by the opinions of diuers men in the Lawes of our Countrey this our cause may, and wilbe drawen within the compasse of an olde Lawe enacted as well by our Catholike Bishops and Prelats, as by the Prince aboue 300. yeeres agoe, viz. the Law of Premunire, because it is an externall iurisdiction brought into this Realme, against the wil, & notice of the prince and countrey: which made the late reuerend Bishop of Lincolne, D. Watson, to refuse all externall iurisdiction offered him ouer his fellow prisoners, although once hee had lawfull Episcopall Iurisdiction within the Realme, & was unlawfully deprivied thereof. Thus much doeth this author cite out of the English booke, to proue that the priests, to worke mischief doe teach the persecutors in plaine words, that all who obey the archpriest, are within compasse of treason. Is this fellow in his right wits trow ye? or must not his Reader be very credulous, or at the least very forgetfull, who being told, that he shall see how the Priests to worke mischief teach the persecutours a lesson to bring the obedient within compasse of treason, must be serued with an example of a Premunire? But neither doe the Priests affirme in this place, that the Archpriest, or those who obey him, incurre the Statute of Premunire, but say onely, that by the opinions of diuers men in the Lawes of our Countrey, this our cause may, and will be drawen within the compasse of an olde Law, &c. And in that they say of diuers men, they leaue a scope for others to be of the contrary opinion. And if the matter were so cleare, as all men were of that opinion, there being as expert Lawyers of the Priuie Councell, as any other are, how can they bee thought to bee taught by the Priests, that there is here in our case any danger of a Premunire? Who can iudge whether the follie  
P of



of this authour or his malice were greater, when he alleged this sentence out of the Priests their booke, to prooue that they *to worke more mischiefe, did hereby teach the persecutors in plaine wordes to bring all good Catholikes that obey this ordination and the Archpriest appointed by his Holines, within the compasse of treason for matter of State?*

Let vs put the case that there were no danger of a *Premunire* in this our case: yet if by the opinions of diuers men in the lawes of our Countrey, it might, or would be drawen within the compasse of such a law, it had bene wisdom to haue paused vpon the matter, and not to haue runne ouer headlong into so great a danger vpon a letter of a Cardinall: which added affliction vnto affliction, without any good, or ease to men otherwise afflicted, and might very well haue bene omitted, and God much better serued, except onely in the triall of his priests, who haue euer since the institution of this authoritie, liued vnder a grieuous yoke, and most extreame persecution, vnder the Archpriest, Iesuites, and other their ouer forward, and busie adherents.

And whereas this authour noteth, that the Priests would haue consent of the prince (though different from them in religion) to be needfull for legitimation of this authoritie, hee doth but shew how his pen can play the Gentleman vs her to his wit. The lesse the likelihood is, that the Prince would legitimate this authoritie, the greater was the reason, which the Priests did vse for their forbearance to yeelde vnto it. It is very well knowen, that when the prince did not differ in religion, the statutes against the prouision of dignities from Rome was sued. And can any man of reason hope for more fauour at the hands of a prince, who doth differ in religion? If this Archipresbyterie could be prooued so necessary, as without it the Catholike religion could not stand in England, this glasse were to some purpose, and the Priests no doubt, would haue bene as resolute in the behalfe of the Catholike faith, as they are not sparing their liues in the defence thereof, which they daily giue for it, although through the businesse of a fewe vntimely Statesmen, they are all generally taken for such, and are  
put



put to death as traytors. But the Archipresbyterie being no way so necessary, but that it might with much more profit to Gods Church haue bene wanting, the Priests most resolute to die in defence of the Catholike faith, might aduise themselves whether it were wisdom, to runne needelesly into an other danger, and of such qualitie, as if the magistrate had no way differed in Religion, he would haue put the law in execution against them.

An other note, which this authour maketh, is, that by the Countrey, the Priests must needs meane themselves only: that is to say, *some fīue or sixe that opposed themselves at the beginning, for that his Holinesse had not asked their consents.* See I pray you, how this fellow stil thrusteth in *his Holinesse* in this action, who was not knowen in 12. moneths after, to haue dealt therein, except what might be gathered by the imprisonment of the two Priests, who went out of England to Rome, to haue shewed what they, and others thought meete hee should vnderstand: although this their imprisonment being such, and in such manner, before they had audience, was an argument to some, that it was not his action, and that aswell *his Holinesse* in particular, as that Sea, and those who did fly thither for succour, were too too much abused: and this imprisonment of the two priests was about ten moneths after the institutiō of the Archipresbyterie. How handsomely would this fellowes musicke sound, were this string in tune, vpon which he harpeth so often? But it being so generally knowen, that his Holines was not seene in the action vntill his *Breue* came, which was aboue a yeere after the institution of the authoritie, no man but he, who is past shame, would so often vrge *his Holinesse*, or *disobedience to his Holinesse*. And in this place he giueth this cause in mockage, why *fīue or sixe opposed themselves at the beginning, for that his Holinesse had not asked their consents.* Alas poore man, how faine he is of any foolish conceite, to bring the priests into a contempt with the Catholikes? Whose *consent* did *his Holinesse* aske, when he confirmed the authoritie by his *Breue*? I am well assured that he asked not the consent of any of them: and yet if the Pope be of any credit, or his *Breue* of the 17. of August 1601. they did



all presently without delay yeeld themselves. So that this absurd fiction of this fellow is too too apparant. I would also demand whether his Holinesse had the consent of any of the Secular priests in England, when this authoritie was first instituted, and of how many? If he had not the consent of them, as doubtlesse he had not, more then what M. *Standish* a Iesuit by promise (abusing the priests) gaue for them, & in their names; who sent him not: why is this vrged against *five or sixe*, as though all the rest had giuen their consents to the institution thereof? If he had the consent of the priestes, why was there such canuassing for voyces, or hands to be set to a letter which began thus: *Olim dicebamus*? Why were so many threatned? Why were others (who were not to be threatned) solicited, with, *Now it is Fa. Parsons deuise, you must not deny your hand*? Again to an other: *you shall not deny me, to set your hand vnto it*: And afterward his hand was set to it, and he knew not thereof, nor gaue any consent thereto. And in this kind did the Iesuits labour, and posted from one to another, to get consents, after that they sawe some to forbear to yeelde themselves vnto it. What deuises were vsed to others for their liking hereof, may also be gathered by M. *Blackwels* behauour in this point: who sending for M. *Collington*, and M. *Charnocke*, vrged them to like thereof, and threatned them, that vnlesse they would positiue-ly affirme, that they did like thereof, he was to send information to Rome, that they did dislike thereof: notwithstanding they would giue no other answere, then this vnto him: that they did neither like, nor would dislike, but would beare themselves as became Catholike priests to do. And this was all the *opposition* which was made *at the beginning*, and it was by fewer then 6. or 5. for it was by these two only, which were enow, and are as many, and perchance one more then at the *beginning* vse to *oppose* themselves against springing *heresies, errors, falshoods*, or the *misdemeanors* of such, as aduenture to shew themselves in priuate, before they appeare more openly to the world. The causes of this *opposition* (as this fellow tearmeth it) are discoursed vpon at large by M. *John Collington*, in his booke lately set foorth of this argument. And thus much in answere of that  
which



which this author noteth vpon the priests wordes, which he ci-  
reth in this place.

After these notes taken vpon the priests words, he declareth  
his opinion of the statute of *Premunire*, in this maner. *And as  
for the Statute of Premunire by them mentioned, it is not so ancient  
as they make it, but was begunne to be treated, about the time that  
Wickliffe rose vp, when emulation was in heate against the Cler-  
gie: and the chiefe purpose thereof was, as the beginning to prohibite  
appellation to Rome in the first instance, vnder the paines aforesaid:  
and the worst kings of England euer since haue most vrged it, and it  
was not made ( as these men say ) by our Catholike Bishops, and Pre-  
lates, nor could in conscience, but sorely rather against their wils was  
it passed in Parliament by the streame of Temporall power, and emu-  
lation against them, &c.* If the priests did speake of a Statute of  
*Premunire*, according to the opinions of men well seene in the  
lawes of our Realme, how impertinent is this to tell vs, what  
the chiefe purpose thereof was at the beginning? and this be-  
ing so, that *the chiefe purpose thereof was to prohibite appellation  
to Rome in the first instance, and therefore no Catholike Bishop, or  
Prelate could in conscience agree to the making thereof: doeth not  
this fellow shew himselfe to be past shame, in bringing in this  
conceite, to the infinite discredit of the Archpriest and his tu-  
tors? We will here omit, how the Archpriest ( who according  
to his sixth instruction, is to doe nothing of moment without the  
aduse of the Iesuites ) when he sent first to speake with M. Col-  
lington and M. Charnocke, stood very stiffely vnto it, that we*  
*might not appeale from him to Rome, vntill it was often inculcated*  
vnto him, how dangerous that proposition was. We wil also  
here omit his commandements vnto vs, not to goe to Rome,  
first to pleade our cause in hand: for to this perchance answere  
may be made, that he had procured, that it should be first heard  
in Flanders, before his Holinesse his *Nuncio*: to whom when  
our brethren presented themselves, and shewed themselves  
readie to haue their cause heard, no one appeared for the Arch-  
priest, although he had before giuen out by his letters, what  
potent aduersaries the priests should there find in this behalfe:  
and the *Nuncio* himselfe had written vnto him, to come or send  
some instructed in his cause. Wee doe here aske, with what  
consci-

*In his Letters to  
M. Collington.*

*The Nuntio his  
letter to M.  
Blackwell.*



conscience haue his godly tutors aduised him, and he attempted to punish such as haue appealed to Rome, because they haue appealed to Rome, as his owne hand will iustifie it against him: namely in his letter to a lay gentleman dated the 16. of April 1601. where he affirmeth, that he writeth vnto him, to make him priue of the great spirituall danger, wherein he, and all that receiued any sacrament of M. Oswald Needam might be, if it were so, that the said M. Needam had subscribed vnto a seditious pamphlet (these are his words) coloured with the name of an Appeale? And hauing denounced M. Robert Drewrie to haue incurred the penalties of his Decrees, for subscribing to the same Appeale, he sent vnto him a forme of submission, which he was to make, or not be restored. And this was the forme of that submission. *Ego N. confiteor, &c. I doe confesse and acknowledge, that without any iust cause I haue complayned of grieuances, and many iniuries offered mee by the most Reuerend archpriest, and haue cast vpon him the blame of these dissensions, tumults, and deadly warres, and that I haue transgressed his wholesome Decrees, of all which I humbly craue pardon, restitution of my faculties, and the remoouing of Censures, if I haue incurred them. And I recall all these aforesaid, and doe greatly wish, that I had neuer spoken, written, or approoued them. Moreouer, I doe sweare that I will hereafter behaue my selfe peaceably, and obediently towards this my Superiour, and will procure according to my bounden duetie what lieth in me, that others doe the same. At London. March. an. 1600 according to our English account.*

The decree which the archpriest made, and by the subscribing to the appeale was, and is iudged by him to be broken, and these grieuous penalties thereby incurred by those, who subscribed, beareth date 18. Octob. 1600. The words of the decree are these *Prohibemus autem sub pœna suspensionis à diuinis, & amissionis omnium facultatum, ne quis sacerdos vllò modo suffragia vel scripto, vel verbo danda ambiat, vel det, ad quamcumq; causam, quã antea nobiscum, vel cum duobus ex Assistentibus nostris non constet fuisse communicatam. Wee forbid vnder paine of suspension from diuine offices, & of losse of all faculties, euery Priest to go about, to take any suffrage, or voyce, any maner of way, either by writing, or by word of mouth, or to giue any such suffrage, or voyce to any matter whatsoeuer,*



ner, which is not known to haue bene before communicated to vs, or unto two of our Assistants. This is the decree, & by vertue hereof the Appellants so setting their hands, or giuing consent, that their hands should be set to the Appeale, are said to haue lost their faculties, and incurred the confures, which, were the Law a iust Law, is not true, the penaltie not being inflicted therein, but onely threatned. And whereas the Archpriest, and his adherents, to saue him from those penalties, which are due, and are *ipso facto* incurred by those who forbid Appeales to Rome, affirme, that there was a *Libel* and an *Appeale*, & that his decree was broken, and the penalties therein conteined, were incurred by subscribing to the *Libel*, and not to the *Appeale*; it is a poore shift, and to be vsed but in a few corners: for in his letter before cyted, he maketh no difference, but in the name onely: For these are his words, concerning *M Needam*, *If it be so that he hath subscribed vnto a seditious pamphlet, coloured with the name of an Appeale.* So that now it is too late, to make two things of that, to which the priests did subscribe. Secondly it is a very grosse ignorance, to make two matters of that *Appeale*, all writers affirming that Appeales made *à grauaminibus*, from grieuances, must expressely conteine them. For breuitie sake *Lancelot L. 3. Instit. Iuris Can. tit. de Apella.* writeth thus, *Multum autem interest, ab interlocutoria, vel alio grauamine, an à definitiua: nam primo casu, & causam &c.* There is a great difference betweene appealing from an interlocutory sentence, or other grieuance, and a definitive sentence. For in the first case the cause of the Appeale must be put downe in writing, &c. Yea it is so essentiall a point to such an Appeale, as no case can be pleaded, which is not expresseed in the Appeale, as is shewed in that *Clementine, Appellanti de Appellationibus.* Thus saith the Pope, *Appellanti ab interlocutoria, vel à grauamine iudicis, non licet alias causas prosequi, quam in Appellatione sua nominatim duntaxat expressas &c.* It is not lawfull for the Appellant from an interlocutory sentence, or from a grieuance of a Iudge, to prosecute any causes, but such onely, as are by name expresseed in his Appeale &c. If then there be nothing in that, which he calleth a *seditious pamphlet*, or a *Libel*, but an *Appeale*, conteining (as it ought) the causes thereof, what a poore shift is this, to say that the Archpriest punisheth, or denounceth none to  
hanc



haue incurred his penalties contained in his Edicts for subscribing to the *Appeale*, but onely for their subscribing to a *seditionous pamphlet*, or a *libell*, colored with the name of an *Appeale*, or prefixed to an *Appeale*? The whole *Appeale* is now set forth in English by M. Colington in his late booke, that euery man may see, whether there is any other thing, then we haue said: that is, an *Appeale*, with the causes thereof expressed, as it ought to be, and as we haue sufficiently proued, it being so euident a trueth, as no man may without blushing deny it. And to conclude this point; if we should attribute so much ignorance to the Arch-priest, and his busie adherents, as that they would separate the *Appeale* from the causes thereof, being an *Appeale a grauaminibus*, from *grievances* (as it lieth open to all mens view to be such) then there is a much greater deformitie in his actions, who proclaimeth, that the Priests haue subscribed to a *seditionous pamphlet*, or a *Libel* annexed or prefixed to an *Appeale*: and that they haue thereby incurred the censures, and other penalties contained in his Edict of the 18. of *Octob. 1600.* because there is not one name subscribed to any thing, but to that, which he must confesse is really the *Appeale*, if hee make such a distinction between the *Appeale*, and that, which he saith is prefixed vnto it. And consequently, he must confesse that he hath incurred the censures of holy Church, and the iudgement giuen against the Bishops in this place of the *Apologie*. Those Kings of England, who had the will to prohibite by Statute *Appeales* to Rome, doubtlesse had neuer the grace to goe to *Goose faire*, where not onely they, but their Nobles also, aswell the Spirituall, as the Temporall might haue learned, how they might with conscience haue enacted, or consented to the making of such a Statute. But this one thing was wanting to make perfect their felicitie in this world: they neuer eate a goose at that faire, where the courtesie is to minister geese to all commers *gratis*, and the Host will not receiue any money for them: onely they must pay for the sawce, which (according to the custome of the faire) they must haue, or els they must haue no goose. O happy day, wherein that faire was first instituted, and a secret discovered; which no Catholike Kings or Prelats could euer attaine vnto. And thrice happy are they, who by the light (as it should seeme)



seeme) of that day did see to make that *Statute* in the third yere of the Archipresbyterie of M. George Blackwell, *vidi preuaricantes, &c.* 18. Octob. 1600, wherein, al right to appeale to Rome being most Catholike'y conserued, the penalties therein conteined doe onely light vpon such as haue set their hands to that, which is prefixed to the Appeale, which is nothing els, but the causes thereof: without which (according to the custome, and Canons of holy Church) the appeale is of no force, and are therefore by name to be expressed, as we haue before shewed out of the *Clementine: Appellanti de Appellationibus*. Now it remaineth, that we shew when, and vpon what occasions the Statutes were made, by which the prouisions from Rome, and some Appeales to Rome were forbidden.

First concerning these prouisions, there was a statute made, either in the 30. or 35. or as some other affirme 25. *Edward 1.* which was aboue 300. yeeres since, wherein it is agreed, and established, that they should not be suffered. There was also the like statute made in the 25. yere of *Edw. 3.* to the like effect, by which it was forbidden, that any should be placed in any dignitie, without the assent of the King. The same is also forbidden in the Parliament holden in the 38. of the same King. The occasions of enacting these statutes are set downe, as well in that of the 25. of *Edw. 1.* as elsewhere: & the iustice of those, which were made in the time of *Edw. 3.* is the more apparant by a letter, which hee and his nobles sent in the 17. yeere of his reigne, to his Hol. to haue redresse for such defaults, as were in that kind committed. The Letter was to this effect.

King Edward and his Nobles perceiuing the derogation that was done to the Realme, by such reseruations, prouisions, and collations of benefices, as the Pope practised here in England, wrote to him, requiring him, that sith the Churches of England had beene founded and endowed by noble and worthy men, to the end the people might be instructed by people of their owne language: and that he, being so farre off, could not vnderstand the defaults: yet his predecessors, and hee more then had been used, by diuers reseruations, prouisions, and collations made to diuers persons, some strangers, yea and some enemies to the Realme, wherby the money and profits were carried forth, their Cures not provided for according to the founders minds: they there-  
Q
fore



fore vpon due considerations thereof, signified vnto him, that they could not suffer such enormities any longer: and therefore besought him, to reuoke such reseruations, prouisions, and collations, wholly to auoid such slanders, mischiefes, and harmes as might ensue; and that the Cures might be committed to persons meete for the exercises of the same, beseeching him further without delay, to signifie his intention, sith they meant to bestow their diligence to remedie the matter, and see that redresse might be had. Giue in full Parliament at Westminster 18. of May Anno Dom. 1343. Thus far out of Iohn Stow 17. Edw. 3. where he also citeth Auesburie and Honingford.

Secondly, concerning the forbidding of the appeales to Rome, we find a Statute made in the 27. of Edw. 3. against those who shall drawe any person in plea (out of the Realme) of a thing whereof the knowledge appertained to the Kings Court, or of such things whereof iudgement was giuen in the Kings courts, or should sue in any other courts to defeate or let the iudgements giuen in the Kings Court.

To these, and other Statutes to the like effect, the author of the *Apologie* affirmeth, that the Catholike Bishops neither did nor could assent. But whatsoeuer may be said for or against this position, concerning the appeales, no man can in reason think, but that they both might very well, and did assent to those statutes, which were made against the prouisions, or bestowing of dignities in England, without the kings consent, the causes are so apparantly layd downe by the King and the Nobles, for that abridging of his Holines his promoting whom he would, and to what dignities hee would in England. And thus much may be alledged in the behalfe of the consent of the spirituall Lords to the statute against those appeales, That in the new great abridgement printed Anno 1551. there is this clause set to the end of some statutes, *But the spirituall Lords assented not to this statute.* And there is no such note set to any of these Statutes which we haue here cited.

It is also euident, that these statutes were not made vpon any heate of emulation against the Clergie: for as we finde that in the 38. yeere of King Edw. 3. the statutes against those prouisions made in the 25. and 27. of the same King, are confirmed, although there be some fauour giuen to the Lords and Prelats offenders:



offendors : so in the 39 yeere of the same King (which was the next yeere after) we find that the Clergie in England was in as great honour, as any Clergie in the worlde, as may be shewed by the offices which the Bishops and Priests had then in England. For the Bishop of *Canterbury* was Lord Chancellour of England : the Bishop of *Bath* was L. Treasurer : the Archdeacon of *Lincolne* was Lord priuie Seale : the Parson of *Somerſam* was master of the Rolles : ten beneficed Priests were masters of the Chancerie : the Deane of *S. Martins le grand* was chiefe Chancellour of the Exchequer, Receiuer, and Keeper of the Kings Treasure and Jewels : the Archd. of *Northampton* was Chancellor of the Exchequer : a Prebendarie of *S. Martins* was Clerk of the priuie Seale : a Prebendarie of *S. Steuens* was Treasurer of the Kings house : the Parson of *Auon* or *Oundell* was master of the Wardrobe : the Parson of *Fenny Stanton* was one of the Chamberlaines of the Excheq. and Keeper of the Kings Treasury and Jewels. Other of the Clergie are noted to haue ben in office also in France, & in Ireland, as well as in England.

*John of Gaunt* Duke of Lancaster, the fourth sonne of King *Edward 3.* hauing the gouernement of England committed vnto him in the time of his fathers last sickenesse (which was in the 50. and 51. of his reigne) disposed so farre of matters and offices, as he conceiued some possibility to attaine to the Crown, and to depriue his nephew, *Richard* of *Burdeaux*, who was sonne to the Blacke prince *Edward*, the eldest sonne of King *Edward* the third. But perceiuing that it would be hard for him, to obtaine his purpose, so long as the Church stood in that estate it did, and the citizeens of London enioyed their liberties, hee laboured to ouerthrow them both. For the ruine of the Citie liberties, he deuised that it should no more be gouerned by the *Maier*, and *Aldermen*, but by some Captaine, appointed for the purpose : And that the *Marshall* of England (who then was a trustie friend of his, and placed in that office by him) should vse his authoritie, as well in London, and the liberties thereof, as els where : which the Commons taking in euill part, rose together in great multitudes, and in *heate of emulation* (to vse this authors words) sought the *Duke*, and the *Marshall* with such fury, as if the Bishop of London had not happened to appease them,



them, the *Duke* and the *Marshall* had not escaped them. But when all was quiet, and the best of the Citie (for the common fort would not obey it) had giuen such satisfaction, as the king commanded, the *Duke* tooke exceptions thereat, affirming *that they knew his minde, and were not ignorant, how to make satisfaction: with which words* (sayth the historie) *the citizens were much troubled: for, quoth they among themselves, hee would haue vs to proclaime him King, but this shall neuer be done.*

The way, which hee tooke to ouerthrow the estate of the Church, was by countenancing *Iohn Wickliffe*, who, by reason of an hypocriticall demeanour among the Common people, had gotten an opinion of *holinesse*. Hee had liued as a secular priest; but afterward hee changed his habit, and conuersed with the Friars mendicants. Hee and his company went bare footed, and in course russet garments down to the heeles. They preached especially against Monkes, and other religious men that had possessions: and for this cause got in some fauour with the Religious, who had no possessions, and were assisted by them in that cause. This *Wickliffe* being called before his Ordinary, to answere for certaine wordes spoken by him, was brought in by the *Duke*, and the *Marshall* into *S. Pauls Church* in London, and was bidden by them to sit downe, as hauing much to answere: which when the Bishop *Courtney* of London vnderstoode, hee countermanded it. Whereupon the *Duke* and the *Marshall* tooke occasion of anger against the Bishop: and the *Duke* threatned to pull downe both the pride of him and of all the Bishops of England. He had before caused all the goods of the Bishop *Wickham* of *Winchester* to be seized on, and would not suffer him to make his answere, and had persecuted others, who had bene most vsed by his father in the gouernement of the Realme. But shortly this Bishop had his temporalities restored vnto him by king *Edward* against the *Dukes* will: and presently after, the *Duke* and he were made friends at the very beginning of the reigne of King *Richard* the second, who succeeded King *Edward* the third. And this accord was not onely made betweene them, but also betweene the *Duke*, and the citie. And thus ceased that *heate of emulation*, so soone, as it was begun, and yet it began not, vntill the 50 or 51 yeere of



of K. *Ed.* the 3: in whose 17, 25, 27, & 38 yeres of his reigne, the statutes before cited were begun to be treated of, & made, concerning the abridging of prouisions for dignities from Rome, and the forbidding of Appeales in some cases to Rome: besides what we brought, concerning the first of these two points out of a statute made about 300 yeres since: to wit in the 25 of *Ed.* the first. By which it may appeare that it was treated, concerning these points, before *Wickliffe* rose: & how deceitfully these matters are layd vpon a *heate of emulation against the Clergie.*

And although in the 9 yere of the reign of K. *Rich.* the 2, there was a Bil put vp in the Parliament, against the Clergy for their temporalties: the King hearing (sayth the story) the inordinate cryings out of the Laity, & the iust answeres of the Clergy, commanded that the bil should be cancelled, & such inordinate petitions to cease: & affirmed, that he would preserue the church, during his time, in as good state, as he found it, or in better. And the king, being then not past 20 yeeres of age, no doubt but his nobles counselled him in this his answer: which is an argument, that at that time the aduersaries of the Clergy did beare no great sway in England. In the 18. yeere also of his reigne, the Clergie and religious men being oppugned by certaine fauourers of those hypocritical *Lollards*, the King being in Ireland, & certified therof, hastened home, and threatned those fellows, that if they did from thencefoorth fauour the *Lollards*, or in any wise comfort them, he would extreamly punish them. By which it is euident, that what was enacted; or confirmed by him in the 16 yeere of his reigne, which was two yeres before this, or at other times concerning those points, cannot bee construed to haue bene done by *heate of emulation against the Clergie.*

King *Henry* also the fourth, who was sonne of *John of Gaunt*, and succeeded King *Richard* the second, was so great an enemy to these *Lollards*, as in the beginning of his reigne at a Parliament held in *London*, he made a statute against them: wherein it was enacted, that they should be apprehended, and deliuered to the Bishop of the Diocesse: and if they were found obstinate, they should be degraded, and committed to the secular iurisdiction, to be executed. And in the fifth yere of his reigne, when some to relieue his want, made a motion in the Parliament,



ment, to haue the Clergie depriued of their temporalties, and *Thomas Arundel* Archbishop of *Canterburie* had giuen his reasons to the contrary, the king and his Nobles stood for the Bishops, and those knights of the parliament, who were actors against the Clergie, were brought to confesse their offence, and to aske forgiuenesse thereof.

To conclude, no one of these statutes were euer repealed by any of our princes Catholike, or other, which concerned those prohibitions of prouisions from Rome, or pleading of matters out of this Realme, the knowledge whereof did appertaine vnto the kings Court, although some particular clause concerning the punishment of the offenders hath been repealed. As for example: where it was lawfull for any man, or at the least not punishable by our lawes, to kill such, as were out of the kings protection, or to be taken as the Kings enemies, by offending against these statutes. And in the first yeere of *Queene Mary*, whom the Author of the *Apologie* will bee ashamed to number amongst the worst kings, (for according to the statutes of our Realme, what prerogatiues soeuer any kings haue had, they are to be vnderstood to be fully, and wholly in the *Queenes*, who come by succession to the Crowne) when no doubt these statutes were in minde, it was enacted, that all offences made *felonie*, or limited, or appointed to be within the case of *Premunire*, by any act, or actes of Parliament, statute, or statutes made sithence the first day of the first yere of the raigne of the late king of famous memory King Henry the eighth, *not being felony before, nor within the case of Premunire*: and also all, and euery branch, article, and clause mentioned, or in any wise declared in any of the same statutes, concerning the making of any offence, or offences to be *felony*, or within the case of *Premunire* not being *felonie*, nor within the case of *Premunire* before; and all paines and forfeitures concerning the same or any of them, should from thenceforth be repealed, and vtterly void, and of none effect. King Henric the eighth also when he was so deuoted to the Catholike faith, and particularly to the Sea of Rome, as he gaue monethly 60000 angels, towards the pay of an Armie vnder *Mounsieur de Foy* for the deliury of Pope *Clement* the 7, when he was holden prisoner in the Castel Angel  
in



in Rome, by the Duke of *Bourbon* his Armie, and the prince of *Oringe*: Yea, when Pope *Leo* the tenth esteemed of him, as of the best prince in Christendome, and either to his deserts, or vnder them, gaue him this glorious title *Defender of the faith*: he did so far forth execute the law of *Premunire* against all *foraine prouisions of dignities*, and authority, to be practised within his Realme, without his assent, as the Cardinal *Wolsey*, notwithstanding an extraordinary affection in the king towards him, dared not to exercise his power Legantine, vntill he was licenced therunto by the king, vnder his hand, and broad seale: which he pleaded, that he had when he was indited afterward in a *Premunire*, for his exercise thereof. And yet was the king himselfe a sutor to the Pope, to giue that authority to the Cardinal, as maybe seene in the tenth yeere of his reigne: which was about three yeeres before he was intituled, *Defender of the faith*. But all aswell princes, as other must stand to this good fellow his checke: and if they displease him, it is enough to haue them accounted in the highest degree of badnesse, how pious, and godly soeuer hee esteemed them before with the same breath,

*To Stow. 21.  
Hen 8.*

But now concerning that which is sayd by the Priests, of Bishop *Watson*, that he refused, vpon these statutes, all externall iurisdiction offered him ouer his fellowe prisoners, this good fellow sayth, that *it is most contumelious and false*. Whome shall we beleue in this case? those who were Priests, and fellow prisoners with him, and were present at the offer, and his refusall, and are eare-witnesses therof; or this peremptorie fellow, who careth not what passeth him? But perchance his reason may ouerpeaze the relation of these witnesses, although for many respects most reuerend. For (sayth hee) *that had bene to deny his Holines Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction in England*. Marke (I pray you) this reason, and weigh it with that which is before saide and shewed concerning this point. Card. *Wolsey* would not exercise his power Legantine in England, vntill he had licence of his Maiestie, as appeareth by his plea before cited: and yet neither the king nor he denied his Holines Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction in England; as appeareth by that the king of England made request to Pope *Leo*, to constitute Card. *Wolsey* his Legate in England,



England, and behaved himselfe so Catholically, as hee was called *Defendor of the faith*. Also the most Catholike Bishops, who liued in the times of many, and those most Catholike Princes without al doubt obserued the law, yet no way were to be touched, as this peremptory companion would haue them, with a *deniall of his Holines iurisdiction in England*. And in the Parliament holden 16. *Rich. 2.* the Bishops doe make a difference betweene *authoritie* in the Pope to excommunicate, and the *execution* thereof in England. Moreouer, this Doctor *Watson* when he was made a Bishop, hee had licence of her Maiestie, who then was, before he would take vpon him to vse his Episcopall iurisdiction in England; as he related himselfe to some yet liuing, & of credit. And no doubt this was done vpon the same ground (that lawe of *Premunire* standing in full force in her time, as being neuer repealed, but rather suffered voluntarily to stand in full force) as may be gathered by an acte *primo Maria*: yet no Catholike doubteth, but that her Maiestie did acknowledge the Popes authoritie in England, as appeareth by her repealing diuers statutes made by her father, to take away the Popes authority in England; *Anno 1. & 2. Philip. & Maria*. So that the folly of this fellow is exceeding great in giuing this reason, why the Bishop could not refuse all externall iurisdiction offered him from his Holines.

Againe, although Doctor *Watson* were Bishop of *Lincolne*, and had vsed his iurisdiction in that Diocesse by the licence or permission of Queene *Mary*: yet he was neuer Bish. of *Ely*, in which Dioces these prisoners liued, who offered him that externall iurisdiction: so that his refusing all externall iurisdiction ouer his fellowe prisoners, is no way to be brought within the compasse of denying his Holines Ecclesiastical iurisdiction in England. And if his Episcopall iurisdiction were so enlarged by his Holines, that he might haue vsed it ouer all England, yet might he most iustly haue refrained from the present exercise thereof in that ample maner, hauing neuer had any such licence, or assent from his Soueraigne, according to that Statute, which was made 25. *Edw. 3.* wherein it is enacted, that *first the Kings license, to chuse, was to be demanded, and after election, his royall assent was to be had*. And as he was not to expect, that a Prince  
of



of a contrary Religion should legitimate any such authoritie in him, so he was to assure himselfe, that a Prince of a contrary Religion would take hold of that Statute against him: seeing that Princes, who were of the same Religion, did both enact it, and cause it to be most strictly obserued, and yet they neuer denied his Holines Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction in England. And by this it is made most manifest, how Bishop *Watson* might acknowledge his Episcopall iurisdiction from Rome, and yet refuse to exercise the same, without deniall of the Popes Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction in England any more, then for 200. yeeres together al the Catholike Bishops in England did before him.

But I cannot a little marueile, that this authour would compare the *association* (intended in England) with this *Archipresbyterie*, which is so pontificall or maiestically, as the Title (which by vertue thereof he vseth) is enough to make such meane men as his fellowes are, not to know which way to looke. For thus he writeth himselfe: *George Blackwell by the grace of God, and the ordinance of the Sea Apostolike, Archpriest of England.* We will put the case, that the *association* intended had gone forward: but then how (sayth he) would that haue stood without externall iurisdiction, seeing that one of these two points they must confesse, that either they would haue asked confirmation thereof from Rome, and consequently it would haue bene an externall iurisdiction as well as this of the Archpr. or else they would haue gouerned absolutely of themselues, without any dependance or approbation of his Holinesse? And this had bene a farre worse inconuenience, to exclude wholly the Sea Apostolicke, for auoiding the statute of *Præmunire*. Wherefore whither this spirit tendeth, all men doe see. But fewe men yet doe see, whither this spirit tendeth: neither must they so much as aske a question. which may imply a doubt of any thing which this author affirmeth. If the Priests must confesse, that either they must haue asked a confirmation of their *association* frō Rome, or else haue excluded wholly the Sea Apostolike, what must the eightene (so often surnamed *quiet Priests of Wisbich*) confesse, who sought no confirmation of their enforcing and violent *agencie* or gouernement vnder *F. Weston* the Iesuit? Must they confesse, that they did wholly exclude the Sea Apostolike? or had they any priuiledge aboue other Priests, to confesse that it was

R

not



not of any necessitie for them either to *seeke a confirmation from the See Apostolike*, or to *exclude it wholly*? Had it not been a sufficient acknowledging of the authoritie of the See Apostolike, if they had alwayes beene ready to haue dissolued their *association*, vpon notice from his Holines, that he would not haue any such *association* in England? Is euery dutiful respect, which one man or two will cary voluntarily to a third, to be confirmed by the *See Apostolike*, or else that *See* to be thought *wholly to be excluded*? It is most certaine, that the *association* intended, was of no other, then such as would voluntarily subiect themselues to a course of life for their owne both spirituall and temporall good, and to do what good they could to all others, although they would not be of that company, as their rules did shewe. Cannot this good fellow make a difference between the sending in of an *authoritie*, which must imply necessarily an *externall iurisdiction*, and include the accepters thereof within the Statute of *Pramunire* (vnlesse the prince had accorded vnto it) and the sending out to haue a liking of a *confraternitie* of priests, or *association*, which might haue beene, whether the Pope had liked it or no, vntill he had forbidden it, it hauing no such title of *dignitie*, as required necessarily any acte of the Pope, or externall iurisdiction to erect it, or her Maiesties allowance, licence, or assent, if shee had bene of the same religion? If there were no other, this title of the *Archpriest* would make a great difference: *George Blackwell by the grace of God, and the ordinance of the See Apostolike, Archpriest of England.*

This author hauing pleased himselfe in prouing a contempt (as he weeneth) in the priests concerning this authority, he stil inculcateth, that it was instituted by his Holinesse, and confirmed afterward by an expresse *Breue*, as though it had bene knownen before the comming of the *Breue*, that his Holinesse had any part in it, or that any of these forementioned matters had bene first, or formerly vrged by the priests, after that they had full notice of the Popes mind therein, and not rather been only published afterwards, to the end that all might see (who would) what reason the priestes had to forbear, to subiect themselues vnto the authority, at the sight of the *Cardinall Caietans* letters. And whereas hee would after shew out of the  
priests



priests their owne words, how dangerously they doe teach disobedience to this authoritie, and to all other, which they mislike: and in the margent putteth this note: *Dangerous and offensive doctrine*: he doth infinitely discredit himselfe: the doctrine as he hath here deliuered it, being so sound and Catholike, as whosoever shall gainsay it, will prooue himselfe an *Asse* or an *heretike*. Neither can his malicious descant vpon these words, which he citeth, preuaile in the iudgement of any, who hath iudgement. As for example, that *by this doctrine men are taught, to examine euerything, comming from their Superiors, by their owne iudgements, and to admit, what they please, and leaue the rest*: For the discourse, from whence these words are taken, which are here cited, doth plainly shew, that the priests relied vpon the iudgement of many learned men from beyond the Seas. And whereas the priests their wordes are these: that *no man is bound in all things to beleue, or execute what euery man in authoritie ouer him shall put vpon him*: he peruerteth this sentence, and telleth his reader, that *the priests doe teach that euery thing must be examined*: which the priests neuer affirmed: or *that which pleased them should be admitted*. And in this matter of *schisme*, which was not euery thing, but one speciall thing, and of great importance, they relied vpon the *censure of Paris* as all men do know, which cleared them from it, and also from sinne: from which also his Holinesse hath now declared that they were free, notwithstanding that *M. Blackwell* was an Archpriest, & a Superior, and stood most peremptorily in that error: And by his being in authoritie, countenanced such his forward adherents, as by their audaciousnes in this present controuersie haue giuen earnest, that they will be most ready, if occasion be offered, to raise a most dangerous faction against the Clergie, without all respect of duety, or correspondence in good desert toward them. And to the question mooued here in the *Apologie*, *what other way did heresie take at the beginning against Ecclesiasticall gouernours, or what other gate did some vnquiet and disobedient Catholikes in those dayes open to heresie: who being offended with their superiours, taught, that their subiects in conscience might dissent from them, and disobey them in diuers cases*? I answered that heresie neuer found her way into the world by truth, or Catholike doctrine,



ctrine, (as that is which is cited here in the *Apologie*, out of the priests bookes, and most ignorantly (to censure it no worse) oppugned by this author) but by falshood, after that the people were caried away with an opinion, that this or that man could not erre, and that all must be true, which this or that man sayd. And perchance the sowlest blocke, at which many heretikes at this day doe stumble, is a supposed doctrine, which (vntill this *Apologie* came forth) was neuer fauoured by any Catholike, and that is: that there are some, who in respect that they are in such place of authority, cannot erre in any thing; which being so apparantly absurd, as all Catholike histories may conuince the contrary, some that heare it, doe resolute themselves, that all the rest is naught. Neither is the exception iust, which is here taken against the priests: to wit, *that they did teach this doctrine in generall without any particulars*, although they might haue done it, without offence to any (but to such as hope by their egregious flattery & sycophancie to preuaile in that, after which they haue long gaped) for the priests deliuered this doctrine vpon occasion of the controuersie of *schisme*, and proued by this doctrine, that the credit of the Archpriest, as Archpr. was not sufficient to conuince, that it was *schisme*: and added in most plaine and particular tearmes, as much as was needfull for this place, for the credit of the chiefe pastour in these words: *And who vpon earth is warranted from erring, but one?* To which, to take away the scandall, which vpon some speeches of such sycophants, as this author is, hath growen in Christendome among the simpler sort of people, these words are most Catholically and truely added, *and not he in all things.*

The exceptions which afterward are taken for *unkindnesse* towards the Cardinal *Caietane*, are very foolish: and those that are for *irreuerence* are as false; the priests hauing always shewed as much reuerence, as the Cardinall did deserue, or they could doe: sauing their duety to the Cardinals *superiour* and theirs, and the libertie which the Clergie hath in all places of Christendome, and yet deserue not the name of *libertines*, as this godly author out his great charitie, and *assistance of the spirit*, which guideth him, termeth them in this place, vpon occasion of some wordes which he saith are vnder the handes of fixe  
priso-



prisoners of *Wisbich*, and were to bee shewed to his Holinesse, to wit: *citò indignabitur libertas, si prematur*: that is to say, *oppressed libertie will not long beare it*. For after that hee hath shewed that the priests dealt vnkindly with the Cardinall Protector, who now hee sayth is gone to God (and perchance had left a greater hope of possibilitie, of some peace in our afflicted Church, if he had taken some of these godly with him) he would perswade his Reader, that the priests doe not spare the Pope himselfe, & for prooffe he citeth one place, where they speake of their boldnes, in repelling iniuries, as though this did any way concerne the Pope, and that other place before cited, which he saith should haue bene shewed vnto him: and then he falleth from this to proue a haughtinesse in the priests, in that they would not suffer themselues to be accounted al the world ouer for *schismatikes*. Other sentences also are cited out of their bookes, where they indeuour to prooue, how conuenient it had beene, that they had had the choyce of their *Superiour*, according to the decrees *not onely of Popes, but also of the Emperours*: at which this Authour glaunceth, and vleteth these wordes: *as though this were more*: as though this were not more, although the one be of a higher order then the other: as when we say, that such a thing is of force by lawe *diuine* and *humane*, when no man is so absurd, as not to thinke that the law *diuine* doth farre excell mans law. But for our purpose, and to prooue, that it was alwayes more to haue a libertie by the temporall Prince his lawe, ouer and aboue the libertie which the Clergie had by the decrees of holy Church: see I pray you, howe this was thought on, when it was graunted by a *Parliament*, that the Cathedrall Churches should enioy their elections, and that from thencefoorth the King should not write against the elected, but should by his letters helpe toward their confirmation. But (sayth *John Stowe*) this statute tooke small effect. By which it is euident, that the Clergie did finde, that it was more to haue the decrees *of the Pope and King*, then the decrees of the *Pope alone*. But if this fellow will say, that two are not more then one, his Reader must take it for an Oracle, and by vertue of *blinde obedience* beleeue it vn-doubtedly.

47. Edw. 3.



In the next point, this author iuggleth vp two matters together: the one *that the Priests doe call into suspicion of forgery the Popes Breue it selfe*: the other is, *that they draw his Hol. pious meaning into matter of State*. For prooffe of the first he citeth these words out of the English booke: *that it was procured God knoweth out of what office*: which words cannot by any, but an euill disposition be brought to an accusation of *forgerie*: The most that can be made of it is, that *Fa. Parsons* might be suspected to haue procured it, where hee might haue his will perchance more then was conuenient; and yet the *Breue not forged*. For as *Rebuffus in praxi beneficiorum, de breui Apostolico numero 16.* doeth note: an Apostolicall Breue, *solet concedi & à Papa, & à Cancellaria, ac à summo penitentiario, & horum quodlibet dicitur Apostolicum, & sic Breuia dicuntur litera Apostolica.* It useth to be granted by the Pope, and by the Chancery, and by the high penitentiary, and every one is called Apostolicall, and so the Breues are said to be Apostolicall letters.

Hauiing then thus shewed that *Breues* may come from diuers Courts, and yet be true *Breues*, we haue also shewed, that the Priests are here falsely accused, where they are said to bring the *Breue in suspicio of forgery*, by making a doubt, out of what court it was procured. But to giue further satisfaction to the curious. The cause why a doubt was made of *F. Parsons* his cariage in this matter, is (as we haue set it down in the booke dedicated to the holy Office pag. 59.) for that the *Breue* affirmed that *M. George Blackwell* was appointed by the Cardinals letters of the 7. of March 1598 Archp. of the English Catholicks, for the better union of the Catholicks of the kingdomes of England and Scotland; whereas in these the Cardinals letters he is not made archpriest of the English Catholicks, but onely of Priests, and not of all the priests, but onely of the Priests of the Seminaries. And we did more easily giue consent to thinke, that *Fa. Parsons* had busied himselfe more then became him, because his Holines, as no doubt he is carefull, that no errors or shew of errors should be in the *Breues*, so he hath no custome to looke vpon them, but only giueth his consent that they be made. Which consent although sometimes the chiefe of that office doeth take in presence: yet sometime he giueth credit to those, who say, that they haue his Ho-  
lines



lines consent thereto. And although he, who is chiefe in that office, must giue also his consent or warrant for the making of the *Breue*: yet he taketh all his information of him who asketh for it, and seeth not the *Breue*, but onely a small abstract thereof, and leaueth it to other inferior officers to draw it as it must be, scale it, and deliuer it to them, who are the procurers thereof. All which is expressed by Zecchius in his booke *de republica Ecclesiastica tract. de prelati Cap. 9. Breuium vero officio prapostitus est unus Cardinalis iurisperitus, qui habito viua vocis oraculo Papæ per seipsum, vel alium facto, absque alia Papæ signatura, omiſſa etiam porrectione supplicatoris, sed sola Breuium minuta ab Abbreuiatore recepta, videt formam Breuis, addit & minuit pro eius arbitrio, & reuſam, minutam, & subscriptam ab ipſo, ſolicitatoribus reſtituit, quæ poſtea apud expeditores fidem facit, & inde littera in forma Breuis in tenuiori pergamena ſcribuntur, & ſcripta ſub annulo Piſcatoris dominico ſub cera expediuntur apud Secretarios domeſticos, & eorum ſcriptores ſere ſemper, & expedita, expectantibus, accepta earum taxa pro rei natura, & ſcripturæ mercede reſtituuntur.* There is a Cardinall skilfull in the Lawe (ſaith Zecchius) who is appointed ouer the office of the Breues, who hauing leaue immediatly from the Popes owne mouth, or by the relation of ſome other, without any other warrant from him, and without the ſupplication, but onely hauing a ſmall abbreviation of the Breues, vieweth the forme of the Breue, addeth or diminiſheth thereof, as it ſhall pleaſe him, and when he hath viewed his ſmall abbreviation of the Breue and ſet his hand vnto it, he deliuereth it baſke to thoſe, who preſented it vnto him, and ſo it is carried as warranted, to thoſe to whom it belongeth to make the Breues. Hereupon are letters framed in forme of a Breue, and written in thinne parchment, and being written, they are ſcaled with waxe vnder the Popes ſcale called annulus Piſcatoris, by the domeſticall Secretaries, and their writers almoſt alwayes; and being diſpatched, they are giuen backe to thoſe who wait for them, paying the dueties according to the nature of the matter, and the hire or reward for the writing.

Let vs now lay theſe matters together: firſt how that Breues be made, and his Hol. neuer readeth them, nor yet the Cardinall who is preſident or chiefe in the office, after that he hath giuen his warrant for the drawing of the Breue, according to  
that



that which was shewed to him by the abbreviator, nor knoweth ought of the matter, but what the procurer thereof suggesteth. Secondly *F. Parsons* industry to further the plots, which he hath layd. Thirdly the credit which he hath in Rome, by reason of the Spanish faction, which he hath many yeres blinded in such sort, with putting so great an Iland as *England*, or *Ireland*, or both in their eyes, as they cannot see how vainely they wast themselves vpon the foolish promises of so meane a man. Fourthly the fault which seemeth to be very great in the *Breue*, where it referreth vs for prooffe of a matter to a letter, which doth not containe that which the *Breue* saith it doth. Fifthly that it may come from diuers offices, and no man can with reason blame the priests if they haue some doubt of the maner of procuring this *Breue*, and also affirme thus much, *God knoweth out of what office it was procured*: Not accusing it notwithstanding of *forgerie*, as this authour most iniuriously, and falsly taxeth them.

Concerning the other accusation, that *the Priests doe seeke to drawe his Holinesse pious meaning into matters of State*: I answer, that *his Holinesse pious meaning* was not knowen, or that he had any part in the institution of this authoritie, vntill his *Breue* came. And if since this time, by the Iesuites meanes, or any others, his Holinesse hath by any acte in *Ireland* or otherwise, giuen the Councell cause to thinke that hee dealeth in State matters, the priests in England are not to be charged with that which may thereupon fall out. And it is said that it hath bene confessed by some, who are in hold now in England, that such a conceite was currant in Spaine, that this Archipresbyterie was made for the furtherance of some State plots against our Countrey, which at that time perchance was concealed from his Holinesse, and a fayrer tale told him of *pietie*, to winne him to institute it at their instance: who hoping to get therby, what they desired, would in time bring the *Church gouernement* into a company of *blind-deuout-obedient* children vnder some elder, or some *Agent*, which had beene to take away all *Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie*, and ancient approued gouernment in our Church. But as it hath bene often sayd, and is confessed in this *Apologie*, the *Breue* came not in a yeere after the institution of this authoritie.



thoritie. And therefore these are very malicious accusations, and constructions of the priests their words, which were written or spoken, when they knew no other, then that all proceeded from the Cardinall *Caietane* at the instance of the Iesuites, whose troublesome and seditious State-humors were too well knowen in England, and gaue too much cause to say more then euer the priests as yet haue said in this kind.

But now to make an end of this second chapter, this author citeth an other proposition out of the English booke, that is: *that confirmation is either most necessary in time of persecution, or altogether vaine, and as a superfluous ceremony in Gods Church.* Vpon which assertion thus he runneth: *which is a very temerarious and scandalous speech, not to censure it any further, but to leaue it to whom it belongeth.* But yet he will haue a blow or two at the legges of it at the least. Let vs see his play, for that the wordes vaine and superfluous ceremony, are contemptuous phrases of the heretikes. In good time good sir: and you by this haue giuen vs some light, how it could be possible, that you should goe so farre out of the way as you doe, not only here, but euery where in this *Apologie*. You haue read, as we take it, that saying of *Elias*, *Si autem Baal, sequimini illum.* If Baal be God, follow him. Those latter words doe best serue your turne, the whole proposition is too heauie for you. Can you find in any of the priests books, where they say, that *the sacrament of confirmation is a vaine and superfluous ceremony*? If you can, then cite the place, and you shall haue humble thankses for your paynes, and shall thereby also put the priests in mind of such their *temerarious, and scandalous propositions*. If you cannot (as we are most sure that you cannot) then must you not be offended, if we thinke that you set vp your rest vpon *Sequimini illum*, the following of *Baal*, and that your company will suite better with beasts, then with men, vpon whose last words, none but such *senselesse echoes* doe take aduantage. His Reader being preiudicially possessed by a comment vpon the last words, he imboldneth himselfe to say somewhat of the whole sentence, to wit: *Neither doth it follow, that albeit his Holinesse and predecessours hitherto, haue not thought the vse of this Sacrament necessary in England, during the time of our persecution (as indeede to no man in any time is it absolutely necessary*



rie to saluation) therefore good Catholikes should esteeme it for a vaine and superfluous ceremony. Note I pray you, the pretie sleights which he vseth. The priests did say, that *this Sacrament was either most necessary in time of persecution, or els a vaine ceremonie.* And he telleth vs, that albeit his Holinesse hath not thought it necessary in England, during the time of our persecution, as though his Holinesse could not thinke, that this Sacrament of confirmation was most necessarie in the time of persecution, and yet not iudge it necessary here, and now in our persecution by reason of such misinformations, as might be giuen him: as if for example, any should say vnto the Pope, as *Fa. Parsons* saide to *M. Charnocke* at Rome, Why can they not now do as well without it as heretofore? Or some other perchance might put into the Popes head, that which some Iesuites put into some of the Catholikes heads in England: *it cannot last long now, the next yeere we shall haue Masse openly in Paules:* or as a Iesuite hauing once promised a gentleman, in recompence of an iniurie done vnto him, to get him a dispensation to marry his kinswoman: and being sued vnto to remember his promise, answered, that he vnderstood that the Card. *Allen* was now vpon his coming into England, and would be here shortly, and dispatch by him selfe this, and many other such cases. Vpon how many motiues may a thing, from one small time to an other, bee deferred, which notwithstanding might bee thought necessary? Can any Catholike thinke, that amongst all Countries christened, onely *England* must be deprived of the benefite of this Sacrament, and that the Sacrament, which is as properly instituted to strengthen Christians in persecution, as Baptisme is to make Christians, must not be granted to the English, as their case standeth? For what els can these his words imply: *albeit his Holinesse, and predecessors hitherto haue not thought the use of this Sacrament necessary in England, during the time of our persecution?* Belike then it is necessary in time of persecution: but we in England must not haue it. Hath he not well holpen the matter? and as for that foolish parenthesis (*as in deede to no man in any time it is absolutely necessary to saluatiō*) to what end is it here brought? who hath euer said that it is at any time absolutely necessary to saluation? Baptisme by water is not absolutely necessary to saluation, as  
some



some Martyrs haue prooued, and yet our Sauour saith, *Vnlesse* Iohn. 3.  
*a man be borne againe by water, and the holy Ghost, he cannot enter*  
*into the kingdome of God.* The like phrased of speech, implying  
*necessitie*, is vsed by our Sauour concerning the receiuing of the  
 Sacrament of his bodie: and yet no man doth say, that it is *ab-* Iohn 6.  
*solutely necessary to saluation.* This question was not, whether  
 the Sacrament of confirmation was *absolutely necessary to salua-*  
*tion*: for this must haue set a stint vpon the power of God: but  
 the question was, whether that confirmation were *necessary in*  
*time of persecution* in Spaine (if you will) when God shall suffer  
 it, or in Italy, if in England and in the English persecution it  
 be not thought necessary. And if it can be prooued, that at the  
 least somewhere this Sacrament is *necessary in the time of per-*  
*secution*, the proposition, which the priestes did make, is nei-  
 ther *scandalous*, nor *temerarious*, nor *false doctrine*: it being eui-  
 dent to all men of sense, that the one part of a disiunctiue pro-  
 position being true, the whole proposition is true. As for ex-  
 ample, if a man say of a Swanne, this Swanne is either white or  
 blacke: His proposition is so true, as no man of any sense can  
 deny it: although it were a most ridiculous assertion to say, that  
 the Swan were blacke. If then we can proue, that confirmation  
 is *most necessary in time of persecution*, he would be prooued to  
 haue bene ouer hastie, who snatched so greedily at this propo-  
 sition: *It is either most necessary in time of persecution, or a vaine*  
*and superfluous ceremony in Gods Church.*

The necessity thereof in time of persecution is thus proued.

That by which onely a speciall grace is giuen, to strengthen  
 a Christian against the assaults of the persecutor, is most  
 necessary in time of persecution.

The Sacrament of Confirmation, is that, by which onely a  
 speciall grace is giuen, to strengthen a Christian against  
 the assaults of the persecutor.

Therefore,

The Sacrament of Confirmation, is most necessary in time  
 of persecution.

The first proposition is euident by light of nature. The se-  
 cond proposition is so generally receiued of all Catholike Di-  
 uines, as they doe *anathematize* whosoever denyeth it, and it is



made plaine by induction: For in *Baptisme* wee receiue grace for remission of *originall sinne*, and all other, if we haue any at the receiuing of that Sacrament: but we doe not receiue any speciall grace to resist the persecutor: and so likewise doe wee receiue grace to such, and such particular end, by all the other Sacraments. But the grace by which wee are strengthened to combat with the persecutor, is only giuen, & vnder this name, by the Sacrament of *Confirmation*. And for this cause doeth Pope *Vrbane*, as he is cited *de Consecra. dist. 5. cap. 1.* affirme, that all Christians must be confirmed: and in the same place *Melchades* the Pope is cited, who affirmeth, that *the helpes, which wee haue by Confirmatiō, are necessary for those who liue*: for in his time all Christians liued in persecution. *Hosius* citeth this Epistle of *Melchades* more at large in his booke entituled *Confessio Catholica fidei Christiana*, cap. 38. where the Pope compareth the Sacrament of *Baptisme*, to the admission into a warrefare; and the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, to the furniture for the battaile. And to shew further how necessary this Sacrament is in time of persecution, he applyeth to it that saying, *Nisi Dominus custodierit ciuitatem &c. vnesse the Lord keepe the citie, he watcheth in vaine who keepeth it.* And afterwards to this doubt, what did the comming of the holy Ghost profit the Apostles, after the passion and resurrection of Christ? He maketh this answer, that thereby they were made able to that, to which they were not before: for that before the comming of the holy Ghost, the Apostles for very feare denied Christ: but after that the holy Ghost was come vnto them, they were armed to suffer martyrdom. And to conclude, this Pope telleth vs, that by this sacrament we obtaine, amongst other gifts, that gift of *understanding*, of which it is said, *Intellectum tibi dabo, &c. I wil giue thee vnderstanding, and instruct thee in this way in which thou goest.* The same *Hosius* in the same Chapter citeth *S. Clement*, who succeeded *S. Peter*; and *Cornelius*, who attributeth the fall of *Nouatus* the heretike, to the want of this Sacrament of *Confirmation*: for *Nouatus* falling dangerously sicke, after that he was dispossessed, was baptized, but not confirmed, as he ought to haue bene, according to the rule of the Church. This Epistle is in the 6. booke of *Eusebius* his Ecclesiasticall historie. cap. 43. By these and other the like doth *Hosius* prooue, that *baptisme* is  
for



for thoſe that come in; *confirmation*, for thoſe who fight. King Henry the 8. in his booke againſt *Martin Luther*, hauing diſcourſed vpon this Sacrament, citeth thoſe wordes out of *Hugo de S. Victore*. *Illic gratia tribuitur ad remiſſionem peccatorum, hic gratia datur ad confirmationem: Quid autem prodeſt ſi à lapſu erigeris, niſi ad ſtandum confirmeris?* That is, *There* (that is, by baptiſme) is grace giuen for the remiſſion of ſinnes: *here* (that is, by confirmation) is grace giuen for ſtrengthening: For what profiteth it you to be raiſed after a fall, if you are not confirmed or made ſtrong to ſtand? And a little after ſayth the King: *Ad hoc enim ordinatur: It is ordained to this end, that a man may boldly confeſſe his faith before the perſecutor.* And to make here an end of this diſcourſe, Pope Leo the 10. gaue vnto the King for this booke, this Title, *Defender of the faith*. And if there were no other prooſe of the neceſſitie of this Sacrament in time of perſecution, that which is here cited out of *Hugo*, and ſo highly commended by Pope Leo, were ſufficient for a farre better man then the fault-finding *Apologie-maker*: and to conuince him, that the propoſition which the prieſts vſed, was neither words of great exceſſe, nor contained falſe doctrine, nor was reprochfull to his Holineſſe, or his predeceſſors: who could not but know, that *confirmation* was moſt neceſſarie in time of perſecution, how ſoeuer they were perſwaded by ſome our backe-friends, that it was not neceſſarie in England, during the time of our perſecution. And thus much in anſwere to the ſecond Chapter of the *Apologie*, wherein the author doth ſufficiently diſcouer by his proud and peremptorie iudgements, whither his ſpirit tendeth: and that his hope to preuaile with his reader, is founded more vpon contumelious words and falſe imaginations, then vpon ſound diſcourſes.



## C H A P. 8.

*How this Authour layeth his plot for the disgrace of Secular Priests, and draweth on his reader with diuers idle stayes. Apol. cap. 3.*

**I**N the third Chapter this Authour intendeth, first, to shew *the great iniuries and ingratitude offered to the whole body of the society*: secondly, *how pleasing and profitable this is to heretikes*: thirdly, *how preiudiciall and dishonourable to all our Catholike nation and cause*: three very materiall points, were they performed. The priests doe shew all these things most plainly against the Iesuits and their adherents in this action. For where as the Priests did raise *a very reuerend opinion of the Iesuits in the hearts of the English* (as Fa. *Campion* in his letters to his generall, confesseth) *and such, as without feare hee could not recount it*, the Iesuits being by these meanes wrought into credite, wrought the priests out so far, as in many places no priest was welcome, who came not by order of a Iesuite: and hauing gotten an advantage (as they thought) of the Priests, followed it to the priests great disquiet, although in the end it will turne to their owne vtter discredite, as already it beginneth, and their best friends doe see it, and wish too late, that their treatise of *Schisme* against the Priests had neuer bene written. The commending of which treatise by their fellow Iesuits, or the not punishing of so famous a libeller, hath iustly drawen on a hard conceit of the whole body, especially the superiour of the society, who in conscience should haue corrected so foule a fault, and chiefe root, from whence doeth spring the present disquietnesse in England among the Catholikes, and a very profitable pleasure to the Protestants, who cannot but laugh at this sinnefull folly of the Iesuits, while by libels they would possesse al Catholikes, that the priests, who reconciled them to the vnion of Gods Church, were now themselves become *Schismatikes*, the most preiudiciall and dishonourable calumnation, that euer was raised against our Catholikes, and the Catholike faith.

And



And for the further vexation of the priests, this author proceedeth in this third Chapter, to bring them into the highest degree of *contempt* and *hatred*: he endeoureth to bring them into *contempt*, by telling his reader, that they went ouer-Sea some of them *poore seruing-men*, other *souldiers*, other *wanderers in the world*; good stufte to make priests of, whom Catholiks are to reuerence, and at whose feet Princes are to kneele. And although our Sauour made his choice of his Apostles out of the meaner sort of men, to giue vs to vnderstand that it was their function which was honourable in them, yet these words in this place might for diuers respects haue bene spared. First, for that if any such be among them, it is litle for the Iesuits credit, who procure them to take orders. Secondly, because these who are named to haue bene the authors of the bookes, against which this *Apologie* is written, and seeme by this discourse to be here girded at, haue some of them left more, to betake themselves to that calling, in which they are, then all our English Iesuits haue done: others are so abundantly provided for out of their owne patrimonies, as they do maintaine diuers others of their friends: Others (if al their worshipful friends should haue failed them) were so well placed in the Vniuersities of England, as they needed not to haue come to any such bare estate as to become *poore seruing men*, *souldiers*, or *wanderers*: And he, who was worst of them all provided for, was a scholler of good fame, and so might haue liued in such sort, as he neither needed to *serue* in this maner, or to *wander* in a strange country. Thirdly, the author of this *Apologie* (if he be not mistaken) had he not helped himselfe with his pupils money, with which he was put in trust for his pupils vse, might haue bene a *poore seruing man* in some strange countrey, or a *souldier*, or a *wanderer*, not hauing any honest place of abode in England. For being expulsed with infamie out of his Colledge at *Oxford*, and thereby made destitute where to become in England, resolved to trauaile and to study *Phisicke* in *Padua*, where in a short time his money failing him, which his pupils lent him against their wils, *want* wrought such a deuotion in him, as he was contented to be beholding to the Iesuits in such sort, as here in generall termes he affirmeth of the priests. Fourthly, if the remembrance of sir  
William



*William Stanley*, and of other good souldiers, and zealous men for the Iesuits, could not haue obtained of this author, not to haue spoken so contemptuously of souldiers, and to discredit some of his closest adherents; yet the remembrance of *F. Ignatius Loiola*, the founder of the Iesuits, should haue made him beare a greater reuerence to the name of a souldier. But perchance he meaneth to keepe himselfe well ynough out of his sight, and we feare it greatly, that *F. Ignatius* wil haue litle ioy to looke vpon him, vnlesse hee fall to repentance of these his bad dealings.

And whereas he affirmeth, that *probably some of those* which he calleth heads of the faction; *had neuer bene men of learning, or accompt, or able to write bookes, if the Iesuits had not bene*: It is well knowen, that some of those whom he by-nameth were neuer the better by the Iesuits: some so little, as little might be: and al of them might haue bin *probably men* of more learning, & accompt, & better able to write books, if they had neuer knowen the Iesuits, then now they are: hauing had more hinderance by them, then furtherance, while vnder colour of prudent and necessary mortification, those who would not listen to the spirit which called them to be Iesuits, were enforced to spend their time with lesse quietnesse, and consequently with lesse profit, then otherwise they might. Neither is it here needfull to stand vpon the Catholiks their blushing, to aske helpe now of the Iesuits: for their helps are, as they haue bene a long time (as wee feare) vpon such conditions, as all honest men must blush, if they doe aske them, and those, who are as ready to further the Iesuits plots; as themselues (a notable abuse of the Catholike King his charitie to poore Catholicks) are neither driuen to aske help, nor to blush, when they take it: although their helpe is so prudently offered, as few do surfeit vpon it.

Hauing thus laied his plot to bring the priests into *contempt*, now he imploiethe himselfe to bring them into *hatred* with the Catholicks, by affirming, that *they conspire with the very enemy against their owne*. which is most false: For if matters of Religion be in question, the priests are ready to ioyne rather with the lewdest Catholike in the world, then with the Protestant: although when matters of trecherie against their Prince and  
countray



courtrey be handled, they are as ready to defie the plotters thereof, were they the most zealous Catholicks in the world. Sure we are, that this author cannot iustly challeng vs, that we haue swarued one iot from the Catholicke faith: and his accusation must needs sound euill in the eares of vpright Iudges, when he saith we conspire *against our owne*. I wish also that it were not too sure, that the Iesuits & their adherents haue thrust themselues into conspiracies *against their owne*, if either their Prince and their courtrey, or Catholicke priests be their owne. For it is so palpable as euery man may feele it, how they haue thrust in not onely their aduise, but their persons in actions against their Prince and courtrey, & against Catholicke priests. What greater conspiracie could haue bene made, then hath bene by their slanderous tongues, and infamatory libels of *schisme*, disperfed against them? whereby they haue declared, that they haue giuen hands to all sorts of enemies, aswel ghostly, as visible, *against their owne*, in which their vnion the priests haue no reason to ioyne themselues.

Now do follow certaine exceptions against some marginall notes made in the book dedicated to his Holines. For example in the 23 page, there is this note in the margent, *Iesuita quæ sua sunt querunt*, which this author Englisheth thus, *Iesuits seek their owne, and not those things which are of Iesus Christ*, which is more, then is in the *Latin*, or perchance more then was meant by that *Latine*, or could be honestly gathered, the priests not citing the place of Scripture to which this author alludeth. And vpon his owne addition hee discourseth somewhat in the ende of this Chapter, & concludeth, that *they haue sought those things which are of Iesus Christ*. The error then was, that the priests put this word *sua*, where they should haue put *Iesu Christi*: & haue made the note more true in this maner: *the Iesuits seeke those things, which are of Iesus Christ*: for belike the Iesuits haue no list to busie themselues, where nothing is to be had, which they must doe if they seeke *sua*, *their owne*. They doe rather seeke, where there are some great summes of money to be bestowed vpon the poore Catholicks & priests, who are in want: which almes are *Iesu Christi*, belonging to *Iesus Christ*; and the note had stood very well to this sence, *Iesuita quæ Iesu Christi sunt querunt*. The



*Iesuits doe seeke those things which are Iesu Christs.* The other notes this fellow calleth them trifles, & he might very well haue left them, as many other: For he doeth but stirre vp a desire in the Reader to looke vpō the booke, whence these notes were taken: where he shall finde matter ynough, to make more displeasing notes, then these are which are here picked out. Yet that note, concerning the Seminaries, must in no case bee omitted, although it hath bene often answered, that they are more to the benefit of the Iesuits, then to England; hauing therein such, as they vse, or abuse rather, for the furthering of their present state-plots, & a good assurance, that the Colledges in Spaine are to fal to their share hereafter. The lamentable state, into which the colledge of Rome is brought, wil be declared at large in a treatise therof: The college of *Doway* is brought into these termes, vnder pretence of pouertie, as no man is to be admitted thereunto, of whō there is not great hope, that he will become of the Iesuits faction. The Cardinal *Protektor* willed perchance, that there should be a stint vntil the debts were payd: & this is vsed for a colour, to admit, or reiect, whom the Iesuits list. If one be presented thither, whom the Iesuits like not, then the colledge debts are to be paid: if it be one, who is likely to be factious for them, the Colledge hath credit for his admittance. And if he be one whose friends wil maintein him, then he shal go to *S.O-mers* after some circumstances, where the Iesuits wil haue care for the pious distribution of that which he hath: and nothing is ought worth, which hath not some great prouidence, or pietie at one end thereof.

To conclude, In this chapter the author doeth litle other then weary his reader, with those idle matters, which he hath before brought, to proue *emulation* and *faction* in all places, and actions, where Iesuits haue had any thing to doe: and to the ostentation of the Iesuits actions, he addeth some litle of the zeale of the priests, which would proue, that the good priests dwelt farre from good neighbours, if *I thinke fol. 21*, and such like slips, did not discharge the *vnited Priests* from all the suspicion of writing this *Apologie*, as by the title he would that the Reader should beleue,



C H A P. 9.

*How this Author purſueth his impertinent diſcourſes of troubles among the Engliſh in Flaunders, Fraunce, Italy, and Spaine. Apol. cap. 4.*

**I**N the fourth Chapter of this *Apologie*, the Author intendeth to ſhew how greatly the Card. *Allen*, and others of our nation are iniuriſed, by being ſaid to haue bene againſt the Ieſuits, and what iniurie is alſo offered to the Cardinals *Borromao* and *Toledo*, and his Holineſſe himſelfe. And for his *exordium*, hee declareth how all ſorts doe ſeeke companie, to approoue and authorize their actions. Belike it was not forgotten as yet, how the Ieſuits haue canuaſed, not onely in Flaunders amongſt *the ſouldiers, religious women, and artificers*, for voices in commendation of themſelues, but alſo here in England: hoping that the number of ſuch as can be gotten by *bribes, flattery, or threats*, may in time ouerpeaſe the trueth of the cauſe now in controuerſie. The firſt prooſe which is here brought to declare the Card. *Allen* his loue and affection to the Ieſuites, is out of his letter written to M. *Muſh*: of which wee haue diſcourſed before, and ſhewed how little it can make for the Ieſuits. All the other alſo here cited make as little to the purpoſe, this preſent controuerſie being long after the Cardinals death: to wit, whether the prieſts (who would not be *blinde obedient* vpon the ſight of Card. *Caſetane* his letters for the inſtitution of the Archprieſt) were *(ſchiſmatikes, factious, ſeditious, rebellious, fallen from Chriſt and his ſpouſe, excommunicated, irregular, witches and idolaters, and as Ethnicks, and Publicans)*? In which controuerſie, if any of thoſe ſtand with vs, who ſhewed themſelues contrary to the Cardinals proceedings, while he was ſeduced by the Ieſuits, and brought into diſhonourable actions againſt his Prince, countrey, and friends, what reaſon haue we to reiect their helpe? And if they had bene as bad as heretikes in thoſe actions, why ſhould we be charged as partners in that action, more then any Catholike prince may be charged to be



a fauourer of heretikes or miscreants, who should haue any such ioyned with him in his armie, either for loue or money, when hee fighteth against some other Catholike prince, vpon iniuries offered by the one to the other. Those Noble men, **Gentlemen**, and others whilest they liued, were ready to giue account of their actions in those times, and some will yet perchance vpon this occasion, say somewhat therin: and the Cardinall might shewe himselfe very contrary vnto them in those actions, and yet be very fauourable to the students in Rome, towards the latter end of his life, when time let him see those things in the Iesuits proceedings, which either affection would not let him see before, or little hope to amend them, made him dissemble, which perchance he did the rather, because by the Iesuits meanes with the King of Spaine, hee came to that preferment which he held, and could not so suddenly goe about to reforme, what he saw amisse in their gouernment of the English Colledge, and their generall cariage in English affaires.

The feares and doubts which *F. Parsons* shewed in his letter to *M. Tho. Fitzherbert* doe discover, that *D. Stapleton* dissembled with them, as may be gathered by the bolde carriage of such, as stand with them and their impatient violence, which leaueth no doubt to any how they are caried: and this doctor hauing bene once of their societie, and going out from them, might iustly feare that it would haue bene laid wholly in his dish, if he had declared his mind in any publicke sort, as he did often priuatly to such, as he thought he might complaine vnto, without harme to himselfe. He was also a man of that marke and merit aboue all the rest of our nation, as it was expected he should haue come to some great preferment, which hee was sure that his manifesting himselfe would haue hindered. And this was also an occasion of *Do. Barrets* dissembling, of whose minde there are many witnesses in England: and of his lamentations, for his opposing himselfe against such, as he confessed were the onely men with whome hee durst deale confidently. And although it pleaseth this deuout spirit, to taxe such, as he sayth are of the faction, that they are *a fewe of the meaner sort of our nation*, and that *they carry their known notes of discredit with them, if they be examined*: he who shall examine it shall find the  
cleane



cleane contrary both in England and out of England: and that the Iesuits faction is held vp by such only, as seeing the liberty which the Iesuits & their adherents do vse against the priests, or hoping of some reward by them, do feare to displease them. Which folly, were it once remooued, the Iesuits and their adherents would appeare to be *sicut ceteri homines: as other men are*: (notwithstanding this pharisaicall cōtempt of the priests) and perchance much worse, euen to the equalling of the author of this *Apologie*, who carieth his openly *known notes of discredit*, for the which he was expelled the Vniuersitie of Oxford, and are not yet displayed as they may be hereafter, as occasion may be giuen; but are as much laughed at in priuate by some, as his counterfeit holinesse is admired by other.

The iniurie which the priests are sayde to haue done to the Card. *Borromeo*, Archb. of *Millan*, consisteth in their affirmation, that *he tooke the gouernement of one of his Seminaries in Millan from the Fathers*. This might be an iniury to the *Fathers*, if the Card. did it without iust cause: but being done, the case is to be discussed whether it were iust or no. And the Cardinall being known to be a most deuout Bishop, and not likely to haue bene caried away with any foolish passion in a matter of so great moment, the priests haue layd the blame vpon the Iesuits their misgouernement. And further they say wherein, to wit, because the Seminarie instituted by that deuout Bishop, for the maintenance of able persons for the Church vnder his charge, the Iesuits tooke their pleasure, and choyse of such as they thought would be some credit vnto their own order, and thereby indeuoured to furnish themselves rather then the Church, for which the Seminarie was instituted. And they who gaue this cause of the Iesuites their remooue, were well acquainted therewith, and with those Iesuites, which were thus allured from that state of life, for which they had maintenance of the Cardinall. But let vs see how this author shuffeth off this matter. *The Fathers of their owne will, and vpon their owne earnest suite, left the said gouernment for the great labour and trouble thereof*. Good charitable people, who challenge vnto them a particular vocation to bring vp youth, and labour it in all places wherethey come, as the best policie they can de-



uise to binde men vnto them, without respecting how themselves are maintained for that purpose in the Countrey, or the College, as many other would, and do in Vniuersities much better cheape, where any Lecture is founded for all commers vnto it. The second shift which is here vsed, is farre worse, although in an other kind: for thereby they draw the Cardinal or themselves into discredit. Forsooth the matter was, *the Cardinall would haue had those his schollers more bare in their dyet and apparell, then the Fathers order in their Seminaries did permit, seeing they were to be sent afterwards abroad to poore benefices among countrey people, where they must fare hardly.* If the Cardinall did allow sufficient for them, then had the Iesuites no cause to giue it ouer, vnlesse perchance they could not content themselves with that which was sufficient. If the Cardinall did not allow that which was sufficient, then was he not of that wisdom, of which he was reputed to be, neither could any benefice in all his Diocesse be so beggerly, as that it would not maintaine the Pastour in such diet, as is ordinarily vsed in the Iesuites Seminaries: neither could the Cardinall be so ignorant, but he knew he might, nor so carelesse of the credit of a pastour, but that he would vnite two benefices in one, where one could not suffice to maintaine the pastour, at the least after so meane a rate, as we doe conceiue in is kept in diet and apparell in the Iesuites Seminaries. And this dislike in the Cardinall, of the Iesuits gouernement of his Seminarie, might stand with an opinion, that many of them were good men, and to bee vsed otherwise. As also the Cardinall *Tollet* might conceiue of them how euill soeuer some of them behaued themselves in the gouernement of the English College at Rome. Lastly, whereas the priests are here challenged to haue done iniurie to his Holinesse, for that his exhortation to the Iesuites in their generall congregation is remembred by them, is a very foolish conceite of this author, as also that he would haue vs to thinke, that his Holinesse did exhort the *Capuchines* to lay downe their pompe, who are generally knowen to vse none. But as this authour said at the beginning of this chapter, *All sorts seeke companie*, and of all other, the Iesuites loue the *Capuchines*, because they desire nothing.



CHAP. IO.

*How the stirres in the English Colledge at Rome began, the cause wherof this Apologie-maker doth seeketo colour, and to lay it where it should seeme it was not. Apo. cap. 5.*

**I**N the fifth chapter this Author treateth of the great troubles which were raised in the English Colledge at Rome, after the Card. Allen his death, and challengeth the priests of imprudence, for bringing them in now againe, and defending them in their bookes. And forsomuch as this chapter doth wholly consist of this point, here is little to bee sayd thereof, the story being particularly set downe by such, as to whom these things doe principally appertaine: only these few matters are to be noted, that whereas this Author would make shew, that the Iesuites were drawn into the gouvernement of that Colledge; there are priests yet liuing, who will iustifie, that they were sollicitated by the Iesuits to take them for gouernours: which how willingly soeuer, and sincerely the Students then performed, being caried away (as many yet are, though not so faultily, as those who are now deluded therewith) with the religious name of some, who little deserue it: M. *Sherwine* who is here named in this chapter, sayd not long after in the presence of some, from whose mouth wee writ it, that *they had done they know not what*. What would he haue said if he had liued to see this loue vnto the Iesuits, vsed by the same Iesuits to bring the Secular priests into hatred, euen with such, as will they, nill they, must take them for their pastors, as all the world doth, and hath done, and haue prospered in soules health for the space of 1500 yeres, and more, before this *society* surnamed of *Iesus* was begun? And whereas there is a touch here also, of some troubles raysed in that Colledge, not long after the foundation therof: it is wel known, that they grew vpon the Iesuits their dealings with the students to become Iesuits: which how pious soeuer the desire was in the one to dispose, or in the other to attaine to a higher perfection, was a trouble to the rest, who grew



grew in contempt with the new inspired, and were much lesse regarded of the Iesuits.

But these troubles were quietly ended within the Colledge, after that the Students perceiued that the Iesuits notwithstanding their publike protestations to the contrary, did vnderhand practise themselves, & bare some others out, which were their chiefe instruments in this action. And this is the true solution of that riddle, which is in more generall termes related in the second chapter of the *Apologie*, fol. 170 where (speaking of M. Musb) the author affirmeth, *that no other thing euer wrought the fathers more trouble in the Colledge, while this man was there, then their ouermuch loue and fauour to him aboue his merits, as other men thought*: to wit, when the Reſtor was informed, that (hauiug at that time deuoted himſelfe to the Iesuits, as also there it is sufficiently insinuated) he vsed to perswade the Students to become Iesuits, and the profes were very euident, the Iesuits would neuer belecue it: and their trouble grew by deuising sleights to saue him from blame, hauiug offended in that, for which in publike sermons, the Iesuits would often protest, whoſoeuer he were that should vse it, he should be the ſame day turned out of the Colledge. These troubles being ended, and the schollers acquieted (as ſeeing no remedy without further trouble) and contented to beare what was offered them by this new spirit, which first began to be the ouerthrow of that Colledge, and now of England: Other began in the time of Pope *Xistus* of holy memorie, and then there was a visitation made in the Colledge. But what the causes were thereof, we doe not vnderstand. If this authour could doe any thing impudently, doubtlesse he sheweth his weakenesse in bringing this matter. For as we are informed, those who were reputed the chiefe in that faction, since they came into England (not finding belike such among the Secular priestes, as could sort with that humour) haue betaken themselves to the Iesuits order, and some of them, who are now in England, are as factious in their Religious humor, as they were busie before against the ſame religious order.



CHAP. II.

*How this Author beſtirreth himſelfe to lay the fault of the ſcandalous diuiſion in Wiſbich vpon thoſe Priests who would not ſubieſt themſelues to that insolent Agencie of the Ieſuits. Apol. cap. 6.*

**T**He ſixt chapter of the *Apologie* is of the troubles, which were raiſed among Catholike priſoners in *Wiſbich*: the beginning whereof this author affirmeth, that the priests doe declare in the *Latine booke*, pag. 11. to haue bene a repining in themſelues, that their fellowes would haue certain rules of orderly living: which is moſt falſe. For they haue alwayes attributed the cauſe of theſe ſtirres, to the ſeparation, which the Ieſuits, and their adherents made from them, becauſe they would not ſubieſt themſelues to *F. Weſton* the Ieſuite, as a new illuminate, vnder the name of an *Agent*, which I leaue to thoſe, to whom it appertaineth to diſcouer, if this *Apologie* miniſter occaſion, to ſay more then hath already bene ſayd of theſe matters. And whereas this author promiſeth, to put down *authenticall informations, and originals againſt the narration* which is already made of theſe ſtirres, he bringeth his prooſes onely out of the letters of the Ieſuits, and their faction, who are, and were parties in the controuerſie. And although the testimony of *Fisher* may ſeem to ſome to be of ſome weight againſt the Priests, as hauing been ſometime an enemy to the Ieſuits: yet it ought not to mooue any man of diſcretion, what he ſaid againſt them. For if the author of this *Apologie* be of any credit, *Fisher* muſt be of no credit. For in the ſeuenth chapter fol. 93. *Fisher* is ſayd to haue bene one of the moſt exorbitant diſorderly fellowes in the *Romane ſtirres*: and profeſſing to haue been now more, then halfe conuerted fol. 94. what is to be looked for of him, but the like behauiour againſt the other part vpon this his conuerſion? yea in the very point, for which *Fisher* is brought as an authenticall witneſſe or informer, hee is diſcredited by this Author. For fol. 95. ſpeaking of *Fisher*, thus hee ſayth. *And albeit wee will not affirme all to bee true, which he ſayd: yet many things are ſuch, as they could not be well fained* (perchance that they had a ſwanne to dinner at *Wiſbich*, which was a moſt neceſſary circumſtance to be noted,



ted, and put in print) *and are confirmed otherwise, and the speaking voluntarily* (see *Fishers* relation to D. Bagshaw at Paris, set out by the same Doctor, with M. D. Ely his notes vpon the *Apologie*) *vpon his oath, must be presumed to haue had some care also of his conscience, &c.* This &c. were enough in this place, to make a man doubt what care hee was thought to haue of his conscience. But such testimonies must be taken for *authentically* against the priests. And if there be an *original* brought out against a priest, it is enough: it is no matter, how many vntrueths be in it: for it is an *original*.

The extraordinary commendations here brought of F. Weston we wish he might deserue them: and if his life were so exemplarie in the *Clinke*, the man had an euil chance to be removed to *Wibich*, where his actions are blamed, and prooued blame worthy, at the least in this point very manifestly: that seeing what stirre was likely to grow vpon his *Agencie*, he would not giue it ouer, but would prosecute it, it being a thing which if it had neuer bene thought vpon, might very well haue been missed in Gods Church, and no way necessary for the reformation intended by him and his fellowes (as F. Weston himselfe confessed in his letter to his *Generall* 27. *March* 1598, and is here to be seene fol. 77.) especially without their priuitie, whom hee would should become his subiects, or pupils, or how the good mā would haue had them called, who (setting passion aside) were much fitter to gouerne him, then he them. The cause of the breach when peace was once made amongst them, was in the Iesuits; for that they would not stand to such rules, as were made, but when they listed; which D. Norden taking (as he had iust cause) in euill part, got away the copie of the rules which the Iesuits had, and their faction, and would not restore them againe vnto them: And for this is he challenged to haue broken the peace, which in trueth they did breake: and if he tore the paper, or burned it, they tore the rules, and cancelled them before, when they refused to stand to iudgement, according as the rules betweene them had ordered it. But of this there is not a word spoken.

This authours meaning is, to preuaile if he can by falshood and coufening of his Reader, & laboureth to make him merry with



with now and then some foolish impertinent matter, as here fol. 82. he telleth him how that *there were fixe or seven butteries for 13. persons, they not suffering the 20. to haue any.* And further (saith he) *the party that directed him (M. Mush) after hee had shewed him all these, he brought him to a chimney where also there was good ale, and said, here is another buttery: nay said M. Mush, there is the deuill, whereof that place was called afterwardes merily by some, the deuill in a corner.* And verily it was a matter worth the laughing at: whoreson deuill, the chimney was too good a place for him, vnder correction of that zealous company, the other 20. that would haue all things in good order, and euery one in their due place, as seemed them. For these good and vertuous (as they say of themselves in this chapter fol. 65. and therefore may be beleued in this point, vnlesse perchance they will now disclaime the company of *the united to the Archpriest*, which are said to be the authors of this *Apologie*) brought their diuell and placed him in the chappell: where what worship they did vnto him, either merily, or more seriously, we leaue it to their owne godlinesse to explicate. For we should be loath to say any more, then what all the world talked: that is, that they made a buttery of the chappell, which is in the castle of *Wisbich*. Other many things there are here touched in this chapter, wherein folly and falshood strue for the mastery. As where this author telleth his Reader, that the Iesuites and their faction at *Wisbich* forced none, but such as would willingly put themselves into their *Academy*, or congregation according to the fashion, and example of those priuate congregations of our Lady, allowed by the Sea Apostolike in diuers Countreys. A strange liberty doth this authour take to fitton, seeing that all men doe know, that the cause of breach was; for that some would not subiect themselves vnto that *Academy*, which was devised by the Iesuites and their faction: and that this *Academy* would not eat and drinke with their brethren. Whereupon the breach was first made publikely knowen, an vnusuall fashion, or example in any priuate congregations of our Lady, or any honest company, and neuer perchance heard of before, but among the impurer sort of heretikes: to which separation, because the lesser part would not agree, they are charged fol.



67. that they were so diuided among themselves, as in the yere 1597. as one writeth, that they did eate and take their diet in foure seuerall places, hauing notwithstanding driuen out of the common hall by helpe of the Iaylour, the other part, though farre the greater. But the manner of driuing them out was no other, then that least these (the lesser number) should seeme any way to accord to the separation, made by the greater number, they did sit some of them at euery table in the hall; and not vpon any diuision, which was amongst themselves, as it is here falsely suggested. For had the Iesuities faction had but so much against the lesser number, that they had flocked together at one table, the separation should haue bene fathered vpon them, although they neuer dreamed thereof: and this humour of the Iesuists being knowen vnto them, they vsed to sit at euery table some, because it should be manifest, that the other made the separation. Yet was not this altogether done of purpose to this end: for they vsed before to sit at the same tables, at which now they sate. But if they had now left those places, and haue sitten together at any one table, this circumstance would haue bene euidence enough for their aduersaries against them. There is also a notorious falshood in the 68. leafe, where these priests of *Wishich* are sayd to haue bene the first that appealed from his Holinesse *Breue*, by which the Cardinal *Caietanes* letters were confirmed: whereas they neuer appealed from the *Breue*, but from such grieuances as they haue set downe in their Appeale, among which the *Breue* is none, as there may bee seene. And fol. 76. there is a scornefull speech of the degree of *Doctour in Diuinitie*: where speaking of Master Doctour *Bagshaw*, thus he saith: and all this stirre to make roome to his Doctourship: (a degree wont to be honoured among honest Catholike priestes) which God knoweth in what corner of the worlde he got it, and how worthily: but certaine it is, as farre as we are informed, by ordinary commendation of his Superiours he had it not. God and the world knoweth, that he had his Doctourship, at which this silly fellow gybeth, in no corner of the world, vnlesse one of the most famous Vniuersities in Italy, be to be tearmed a corner of the world. For it is well knowen, that hee tooke his Doctourship in *Padua*, and hee tooke it so woorthily, as this  
poore



poore fellow might come learne diuinitie of him these many yeeres : although his grauitie perchance would thinke much thereof. And it is certaine also , howloeuver this fellow is informed , that he had it *by the ordinary commendation of his Superiour* , who at that time was no other , then his Holinesse , who in his predecessours time , admitted all into the degree of Doctourship , who should be iudged worthy thereof , by such as were in office for that purpose in that Vniuersitie , aswell as in all others : and the most iniurious *Brexe* , which afterwarde the Iesuites procured against all Englishmen , aswell Diuines , as Lawyers , was not as yet procured by them. But this fellow his grieve is , that he , or any other should take degrees , vnlesse they would become of their faction , which maketh them to haue so many venerable Doctours for them , and so forward , as some of them haue not blushed to take vpon them to heare and determine the matters of such learned men , as were iudged most worthy of that degree , and had it , and other honourable places in Gods Church , when these were blockheaded boyes : and cannot but moue wonder and also laughter to those who knewe them , to thinke *in what corner* , or how they came to be made Doctours. But they were the fittest subiects for Iesuites to worke vpon , and stood most in neede of extraordinary commendations from such Superiours , as here this Authour would that *M. D. Bagshaw* should haue had for the taking of his degree.

As for the other points touched in this sixt chapter concerning the stirres in *Wisbich* , I am to referre the Reader to a relation set out thereof , before this *Apologie* appeared , and to that which *M. D. Bagshaw* hath set foorth already at the ende of *M. D. Ely* his notes : and what others , now touched here , shal hereafter say of these matters.



*How this present controuersie is dissembled and fetched from a head in Flanders by the Apologie-maker. Apol.ca.7.*



**I**N the seuenth Chapter of the *Apologie*, the Author intendeth to shewe the generall troubles and disquietnesse, which were raised among the English Catholikes in Flaunders and England, during the former stirres in Rome and *Wibich*, and how the one gaue hand vnto the other, & that all proceeded from different members of the selfesame faction. And this his narration of the Flemish troubles, he beginneth at the yere of our Lord 1588. and continueth it with many idle discourses, and altogether impertinent to the present controuersie. But when he hath told his tale of those matters, then he patcheth thereunto the stirres in England, with an *As in the cōtrouersie against F. Holt, & others in Flanders, these few had against them all the body of our Cath. nation, &c.* So fareth it now in England, where a very few at the beginning, partly vpon stomacke and auersion, or rather discontentment, partly of ambition, vniquietnes of spirit, and desire of contention (as by their doings may appeare) they began to oppose themselues against the whole streame of other Catholikes, deuising particular wayes for their owne preferment. The admirable mildnesse of this *Apologie-maker*, and his true religious pietie! But it is great pitie to interrupt him, for he meaneth to shewe his reader the true state of the question; and thus hee proceedeth, *And since that time haue drawn in diuers other, one vpon one motiue, another vpon another, some for preferment, some for discontentment, some for other occasions, to take their parts: and being once engaged, to leape with them from an inch to an ell, & from a little slide to a headlong precipitation. A godly procession, but where is the true state of the question? Forsooth, and this is the true state of the question.* Happie is he who can vnderstand it: *A few discontented, vpon such causes as this author affirmeth, began to oppose themselues against the whole streame of other Catholikes, but you must goe looke wherein: and those fewe made some other to leape from an inch to an ell: and this is the true state* of



*of the question.* How haue we hitherto bene deceiued, in taking the *true state of the question*, to be in matters principally *between the Secular Priests, and the Iesuits*, as sometime we are told in this *Apologie*, namely in the first Chapter fol. 2. or *betweene the Secular Priests, and their Archpriest principally*: as other sometime we are tolde in the same *Apologie*, cap. 11. fol. 161? Now we must beleeue, that the *true state of the question*, is *betweene some fewe, and the whole streame of other Catholikes*: But what skilleth it, since that euery thing is vsed in his place to some good purpose, for the bringing about that, which is principally intended by the authors of the *Apologie*? The opposition then *against the whole streame of Catholikes*, and particular deuises for preferment, with the making diuers other *to leape or slide*, must here be suggested to be the *true state of the question*, which how deeply it may touch the Iesuits and their factious adherents, is, or will be declared elsewhere; to wit, with what ambition they sought their owne preferment in the castle of *Wibich*, and with what scandall they wrought it, by a most wicked *separation or schisme*, at what time the *true state of the question* was: whether the Iesuites and their fellow-factious committed any sinne, or did like Christians, in making that diuision in *Wibich* from their fellow prisoners, and priests as they were, suffering all vnder that name of Catholikes, and Catholike priests. Secondly, with what ambition, vnquietnesse of spirit, and desire of contention, the Iesuites began to oppose themselves against other Catholike priests, when they writ that wicked and senslesse libell of *schisme*, omitting no name of disgrace which a Iesuits malice could deuise, at what time the *true state of the question* was: whether the priests were bound to subiect themselves to an authoritie procured by falshood (as the letters of institution shewed) proposed with falshood, as then the Archpriest, being taken in the manner, could not deny, put in execution contrary to the tenour thereof, hauing no letters from his Holinesse; besides whom, the Priestes had no knowen *Superiour*, either for the erection of that authoritie, nor any testimonie, that any other had power giuen vnto them by him to make that subordination. Thirdly, with what stomacke, and auersion from all Christian peace the Iesuites proclaimed (after that the peace was made)



made) that they all incurred the censures of holy Church, who should dogmatizando, mainteine, that those Priests were not schismatics, who forbore to subiect themselves vnto the auctoritie, before they saw his Holines letters in confirmation thereof, and the Archpriest published, that he had receiued a resolution from the mother City: which afterwards hee explicated himselfe to some, that it was from a paire of yong Iesuits: to wit, F. Warford & F. Tichborne, or from one of them. The contents whereof were, that these priests were *schismatics*, which is now the true state of the question, (as none but most impudent companions can deny) and the original of these present stirres. And this the Archpriest his fact, the author of this *Apologie* in the 11. chap fol. 168. calleth an *angry Epistle*, and challengeth the priests in termes best fitting his Religious humor, that for an *angry Epistle* they would breake out into such scandalous tumults, and so leaueth the matter without telling, what this *angry Epistle* was, and that it was a proclamation, that the Priests had liued a long time *in schisme*: and what other matters must thereupon necessarily insue, not onely to the discredit of those priests, but also to the disturbance of many deuout Catholicks, whose ghostly fathers they had bene, during that time. But since that this author hath proposed the true state of the questiō, as he saith, to be an *opposition of a few against the whole streame of other Catholicks*, deuising particuler wayes for their preferring, and there causing some to leape, and slide: Let vs do him the fauor to heare how he proceedeth with this his imagination. And thus (saith he) is the true state of the question: let vs declare briefly the way, and path how they came into this pit. Thus he beginneth this declaration.

Wee haue vnderstood by Card. Allens letters before mentioned, written to M. Mush the yeere that he died, how he had vnderstood of a certaine emulation, and deuision begun in England by some priests against the Fa. of the Societie, and perhaps hee perceiued the same by no meanes more, then by himselfe, his speach and behauour, while hee was at Rome with him the very same yeere. I doe nothing marueile that this good fellow, would faine haue his Reader conceiue, that the Priests began a diuision against the Iesuits. For if he could perswade this, he would not doubt, but to deale well ynough with such fooles, as cannot thinke, that the Iesuits can  
giue



giue any iust cause, why the Priests should breake with them. I marueile much, that he is not ashamed so often to inculcate this letter of the Cardinall; which if it make any thing in this matter, it maketh against the Iesuits, as we haue often shewed. For first cōcerning the diuision, the *Fathers* want of good correspondence is first placed, the cause of discontentment not knowen, and *M. Mush* a Secular Priest put in commission to be peremptory, as well with the *Iesuits* as the *Secular Priests*, with whō the Cardinall knew he might be bold, especially in so good an action, as was the furthering of a peace, where he was informed there was want. And for the better satisfaction of such as will be satisfied, we will once againe repeate the Card. letter, as it is set downe in the second Chap. of *Apologie* fol 11. *I haue heard* (saith he) *to my great grieve, that there is not that good correspondence betweene the Fathers, & other Priests. I cannot tell upon what discontentment, &c. But whereof soeuer it commeth, it is of the enemy, and with all possible discretion, and diligence, by the wiser sort on both sides to be rooted out, or els it will be the ruine of the whole cause, &c. And therefore in this point especially (M. Mush) be earnest, and peremptory with all parties, and euery one in particular, and tel them that I charge, and aduise them by the blessed Blood, and bowels of Gods mercie, that they honour, loue, and esteeme one another, according to euery mans age, order, and profession. And then he exhorteth those of the Secular order, which is an argument, that what went before did principally concerne the Iesuits. The maner also of the Cardinall his writing doeth shew, that what he conceiued of the diuision here supposed, was by other meanes then by M. Mush: For had he vnderstood it (as this Author saith) perhaps by no meanes more, then by himselfe, his speech, and behauour, while he was in Rome, without perhaps the Cardinall would not haue written vnto him, after his departure in this maner: *I haue heard to my great grieve, that there is not that good correspondence between the Fathers and other Priests, I cannot tell upon what discontentment: but rather haue put him in minde, what he had tolde him, and would not haue bene left ignorant of the true cause, or some colour of cause, if M. Mush had discovered any such matter vnto him: And whereas here is mention of M. Mush his behauour while he was in Rome with the Cardinall, we may**



verely beleeue, that it was such, as became an honest priest, and that he gaue very great satisfaction, not onely to the Cardinall *Allen*, but also to many other, having those graces, and fauours at his returne, which no man euer had before him: to wit, *authoritie*, not onely for himselfe in diuers reserved cases, but to giue to a certaine number of other priests, whom he would name at his returne into England. But marke, I pray you, what moueth this author to say; that the Cardinal writ his letter vpon *M. Muth* his behauiour, when he was with him at Rome the very same yeere. For albeit (saith he) *this man gaue out euery where, that he went to Rome, to enter into that order, which many yeeres before he had pretended: yet others that knew him better, did soone discover his alienation from them, and that he pretended perhaps by his journey to Rome, to get some other dignitie.* Here there is another *Perhaps* to helpe the former. For first it was perhaps that the Cardinall perceiued a certaine diuision, by no meanes more then by *M. Muth* his behauiour and speech at Rome: and now it is perhaps that he went to Rome, for to get some other dignitie. Good meditations for such spirituall guides, and very charitable. We will not here cite *M. Blackwell* his letter, which was written in the yeere of our Lord 1596, which was two yeres after the Cardinals death: wherein hee taketh on marueilously against all those, who did affirme at Rome, that there had bene *strife*, or any *falling out* here in England, which was worth the talking of: although neither he, nor any man els can denie, but that the scandalous separation in *Wisbich* was begun by the Iesuits and their faction, long before, and is not to this day ended. We wil onely request the religious spirit of the author of this *Apologie*, to let vs vnderstand what reason he had in this place, to make this note in the margent, *How this last sedition in England began*, shewing nothing in the text, but his general conceit of an *emulation and diuision begun in England, by some Priests against the Fathers of the Societie*: and bringeth no other prooffe therof, then the Card. *Allen* his letter aboue mentioned, wherein there is no more mention of any diuision by Secular priests against the Iesuits, then by the Iesuits against Secular priests, as hath bene shewed. And if by this note we are giuen to vnderstand, How that this last sedition in England began before this letter of the Card. *Allen* was written: then at the latest this last sedition must haue



haue his beginning in the yere of our Lord 1594 or before For in that yeere the Cardinal died, as it is here confessed in the *Apologie fol. 6.* Now then if this last sedition in England did begin in the yeere of our Lord 1594, or before, what was the secret intention which this Religious spirit had, when in the 9. Chap. of this *Apologie fol. 131.* it made this marginal note, *The first beginners of the sedition M. Collington, and M. Charnocke by his owne confession;* how could these men be the beginners of this sedition by an acte done in the yeere of our Lord 1598. at the soonest (for so the letter constitutive beareth date, about which this confession is said to haue bene made) when this author affirmeth that *this last sedition was begun in the time of Card. Allen,* who died in the yeere of our Lord 1594. But as the good-wife of an Ordinary saith, *A ioynt is a ioynt,* so with this good fellow, *A booke is a booke* And it is no great matter how one piece is patched to another: the fooles who are deuoted vnto him, wil take al with *blinde obedience:* and for the rest there wil be some other deuise: as to stand stoutly to the auerring of any thing, which may further his cause, or the denying whatsoeuer may hinder it.

Hauiug thus farre presumed vpon the simplicitie of his Reader, he proceedeth in his declaration of the way or path, or the supposed *true state of the question,* and continueth his tale of *M. Musb* his negotiation. *But returning* (saith he) *into England,* as he went forth, and the Cardinall soone after dying, he ioyned with an other of his owne humour, that had left another religion, namely the Carthusians (and in the margent he setteth *M. Iohn Collington*) and they two with some few other, determined to make a certaine newe Hierarchie of their owne, calling it an association of Clergie men with two Superiours, as it were *Archbishops,* the one for the South, and the other for the North, with certaine Rules and deuises impossible to be obserued in England, while times and matters doe remaine as they doe, &c. It is very well knowen that *M. Musb* returning into England, imployed himselfe in more offices of charitie, then all the Iesuites in England. And all the North parts of England will affirme it: especially those who were in durance for their conscience. And when the spirit of the Iesuits mooued them, vnder pretence of reformation in *Wisbich* to make their scandalous separation and *schisme,* he went thither accompanied with *M. Dudlie,* where after that they had



spent some dayes, and perceiued that there was no hope of any accord, but by the cōmandement of him, who was Superiour to *F. Weston*, who canuased in *Wibich* for a superioritie vnder the title of an *Agent*, he came to London, where he found this *Superiour*, and after long conference with him about it, as one, who was loath the matter beganne should go backward, he promised at the length to send such letters vnto *Wibich* by them, that at the sight thereof his subiect *Fa. Weston* should surcease from that intended *Agencie*, and all should bee well. But *M. Mush* and *M. Dudlie* were compelled to send for these letters, and if they had not vrged the matter in such sort as this *Superiour* could not any longer halt with them, they had departed with such letters, as had bene to no purpose, and the time was differred vntill it was so late, as he hoped they would not haue stayed for any other.

The peace being in the ende made, such as it was, and not without this vnder-hand condition, that the Iesuits & their faction might afterward breake off, when they would, *M. Mush*, and *M. Dudley* at their next returne to *London*, if not before, delt with *M. Iames Standish* for the erecting of an *Association* of such priests, as would voluntarily subiect themselves to liue vnder such a superior, and such rules as they should among themselves agree vpon. *M. Standish* communicated this matter to other priests, who liked well therof, & as yet *M. Colington* (not being neere *Lōdon*) knew nothing of this intent: & howsoeuer it hath pleased this author now to except against it, there will be good prooffe made, that the *Superior* of the Iesuits was so farre from speaking against it, as he did seeme to take great ioy in it, vntill he perceiued, that he was not likely to haue the gouernment thereof, as his fellow had in *Wibich* of the greater part of the Catholike prisoners: And if the *vnited priests* were the authors of this *Apologie*, how ridiculously are fixe of them brought in here to credit it, as though there were more honestie in these 6. alone, taken singly from the rest, then 16. in the whole company of those *vnited brethren*, when those fixe also are among them, but it shalbe well seene in a particular answer to their letter, here cited, that whosoever were the authors thereof, those fixe, who subscribed vnto it, had smal cause to doe so, or to thanke them, who eased them of the labour to pen it.

But



But now remitting the reader for *M. Collington* his iust causes of *leaving the order of the Carthusians* ( in which he neuer was, but onely in probation , which argued a most religious minde in him, and was crossed onely by the disablements of his body) to the last point handled by himselfe in his late booke of Reasons intituled *A iust defence &c.* And for *M. Mush* his leaving the Iesuits, to the eleuenth Chapter of the *Apologie*, fol. 170, where it is plainly said, that *they would not admit him*, we will see how this *Apologie* fitteth his Reader.

First, by this narration in the *Apologie*, it is euident, that the *association*, of which here is mention, was not deuised by such as thought *their designements frustrated* by Fa. Parsons dealing at Rome in the yeere 1597, as the author of this same *Apologie* affirmeth cap. 1 fol. 6. & 7. Secondly, it is vntrue, that *these two* determined vpon any such matter. Thirdly, there was neuer any determination to haue *two Superiors*, much lesse, as it were *Archbishops*: For as may appeare by the *rules* made in the North, the very first rule, *De rectoribus*, is this: *There shall be chosen euery yere one Father, and two assistants, by the consents and most voices of the brethren.* And vnder another title afterward there is this rule: *When in any Countrey the multitude of the brethren are increased to the number of eight, and cannot conueniently resort to the consultation of this confraternitie in the Countrey where the Father and the Assistants abide, they shall at their owne discretions chuse a father, &c.* But neither in the *rules* made in the South is mention of any more then one *Superior*. And these diuers *rules* were made, not that one forme should be of force in the North, & another in the South, but that one forme should be drawen for al England out of such *rules*, as were thoght fit by the priests, which liued either in the South or North parts of England. And the forme which was drawen in the South, was accepted by those in the North with some few *rules* added, or altered. And this was so well knowen abroad, and confirmed also by that, the two priests carried no other forme with them to Rome, as I cannot maruile enough at the author of this *Apologie*, that he will cite the *rules* which were made in the North, yea and take his arguments (although foolish) from them against the priests, as here hee doth fol 91. where first he argueth out of them negatiuely, that



there was no mention made at all in their constitutions, that the same should be confirmed by his Holinesse: as though the author of this *Apologie* did not know that *Fisher* vnder his oath at Rome had affirmed, that the priests determined to send some to his Holinesse for this purpose, and named the persons: and if this testimony were not, many are yet living, who made their petitions to his Holinesse vnder their owne handes for the confirmation thereof. And these petitions were taken from M *Bishop* and M. *Charnocke*, among other their writings, when they were apprehended at Rome by the Iesuites. The second aduantage which this Authour would scrape out of those *Rules* of the North is: that *they left no appeale to Rome, or other place*: and this he would prooue out of their Chapter (as he sayth) of *Appellations*, and then he setteth downe almost all the Chapter in this manner, *That no appeale shall be made from the sentence of one company to them of an other Countrey: but all the brethren shall content themselves with the iudgement of the Fathers, and assistants, or more part of the company, where he shalbe, &c.* Thus farre in the *Apologie*. Whereby he would proue that the priests would debarre appeale to Rome. Can any man thinke his wits were at home? is there any mention of any, but of the seuerall companies vnder diuerse *Fathers*, or *Superiours* here in England? and how doth he drawe it to a debarring appeale to Rome? But marke I pray you this fellowes falshood: to helpe himselfe to make this foolish calumniatiō, he hath cited the *rule* or *decree*, as he calleth it: but he cited it with an *&c.* Whereby his Reader should vnderstand, that somewhat did follow, although he said not what. And in that he would haue his Reader knowe thus much; it is likely he knew it himselfe, and what it was: and moreouer that if he had set it downe, he had discovered himselfe to haue bene a notorious calumniator. And the indifferent cannot but note him, for a very false fellow in his dealings. The rule beginneth in this manner: *No appeale*, and so foorth as he set it downe vnto these wordes: *where he shalbe*, and then it goeth on thus: *for the present, vnlesse it seeme otherwise more conuenient, by the most voyces of the company.* So that there is appeale left from those of one company to them of an other countrey, if it be thought conuenient by the most of them. And whereas he  
he



he would hereupon inferre an absurditie against the Priests, like to that, which the Archpriest committed, when he would not admit appeale to Rome, he committeth as great folly, as in any of the other. For the Archpriest stood peremptorily in it in plaine termes, that we could not appeale from him to Rome, and this rule was onely for such, as would in such maner voluntarily subiect themselves to their superiors. And as it appeareth by the rule, there was no mention of Rome. But put the case that the priests had debarred themselves of appealing to Rome, is it all one thing in this Authors conceit, for a man to be content, to part willingly with that which he hath, and to haue it vniustly taken away from him? If the priests had made such a *Rule*, as that they would haue debarred themselves thereof, was this any warrant for the Archpriest to obtrude such a matter vpon them against their wils, hauing no such commission from any that could giue it vnto him, which is also to be vnderstood in friuolous matters? But the good-man must play at small game, or els he must sit still.

That calumniation also is hereby answered, which is layd to *D. Bagshaw*, that he thought it not fit for them, to be tied to *Rules at Wisbich*: For the difference is manifest: for that the *Association* was free for all who would, and who would not might continue, as they did, without any impeachment, either of fame, or what els soeuer: those *Rules at Wisbich* were to be accepted of all so necessarily, as the not accepting thereof was deemed by the rest a sufficient cause, to make that *scandalous schisme*, which was there made, and remaineth as yet, and to defame all those who would not subiect themselves to the Iesuits who were the deuisors, and must be superiors also, vnder the title of *Agents*.

*Touching the detestable Memoriall here mentioned* (sayth this author) *drawen out, and published, &c.* Here is nothing to be said of this *Memoriall*, more then that the Iesuits were the first publishers thereof in England, (so far as we can learne) and translated it into English, for women to see it, and vnderstand it. The contempt of *Vniuersitie men, and graduats*, of which the Iesuits are said to be accused in the *Memoriall*, is not obscurely signified in this *Apologie*, cap 6 fol. 76. where speaking of *M. Doct. Bagsh.* thus the author sayth, *And all this stirre is to make room*  
for



for his *Doctorship*: being a Doctor of Diuinitie, and proceeding in *Padua* with the applause of the Vniuersitie. And in this 7. Chap fol. 93. he putteth this limitatiō of the Iesuits their esteem of *Vniuersitie men and graduats*; *If their vertue answere to their degrees*: that is, to speake the true English, if they will bee wrought to be Iesuits, or factious for them. And whereas it is said, that Iesuits are more hurtfull to Catholikes then heretiks, let indifferent men giue their verdit, after due considerations of the diuisions made by them. And as for this author his certintie, that these articles of the *Memoriall* came from D. Bagshaw, (whom he here insinuateth to haue bene expelled the Colledge at Rome for his troublesome spirit, with a reference to Card. Sega his visitation, which is well knowen to haue bene long after the Doctor his departure from Rome) his perswasion is vpon a very weake ground. For although such articles might be giuen or sent to M. Charnocke vnder his hand, to carie to Rome: yet these articles might come from some other, the *Memoriall* being long before made, and at Rome, as appeareth in this *Apologie*, fol. 94. where also Do. Barret affirmeth, that he found a little compendious note of all their articles against the Iesuits at Rome, which (sayth he) hee (Fisher) carried with him to dilate to the faction in England: and for prooffe hereof he addeth: as appeareth; for it is very old, and almost worne out.

All the foolish story of Fisher, we here leaue out, as not worth the noting, he hauing bene in the iudgement of this author, fol. 93. one of the most exorbitant disorderly fellowes in the *Romane stirs*. And fol. 95. albeit (sayth this author) wee will not affirme all to be true which he said: yet many things are such, as they could not be well feigned, and are confirmed otherwise: and the speaking voluntarily vpon his oath must be presumed, to haue had some care also of his conscience, &c. or of his sides, as himselfe confessed at Paris. But I pray you let there be care of conscience at the lest with an &c. in such matters as may make for the Iesuits. Some things heere set downe are not onely false, but so impertinent to the matter, as we cannot but iudge, that there was much good iugling betweene him, & his examiner: as that which is affirmed, fol. 96. *At London I lay cōmonly with M. Charnock, otherwise called Long, and M. Medcalfe*: whereas the poore man was neuer in any such



such credit with either of them, as that hee was acquainted where either of them lay: yet some things at the least *could not be well feigned*: perchance that *beeing bidden to a banquet at Wisbich he had a swanne*, which was the more to be noted, because it was a very vnusual dish at a *banquet*, vnlesse we turne the *banquet* into a dinner, and then the grace of this relation is marred. For the reader must conceiue that the priests in *Wisbich* did not *dine*, (that is, too grosse) but they did *banquet*: and he must vnderstand, that *the Priests had a Swan*, at that *banquet*. Certainly either *Fisher* did herein shewe himselfe to be too weake a man to be brought here for an authenticall witnesse, vnlesse some such particular question as this is, was demanded of him, *What good cheere had you?* or else the examiner was exceeding foolish, who in a serious matter would fall into such questions, and set downe such stufte in an examination. But had not such folly beene to be vttered, we should haue had no *Apologie*. One thing more is here to be noted, that fol. 96. this author relateth out of *Fishers* examination, that *there passed eight or nine moneths in diuersitie of opinions*: and that he went *seuen or eight times from the North parts to Wisbich, Cambridge, and London, about an affaire which would not well stand with the association then begun*. Which being compared with that which is also affirmed fol. 97. where it is said, that it was not knowne at *his departure from England, that peace was made at Rome, or that Fa. Parsons was come thither*: albeit *M. Bagshaw and his friends seemed to feare it much*: This author must wipe his mouth, for his false tale told in the first Chapter, fol. 6. and 7. where hee affirmeth, that *the reliques of those that had beene troublesome, and vnquiet before, comming into England, and conferring againe with their consorts, of their former actions and designments, frustrated (as they thought) by Fa. Parsons dealing at Rome, resolved to begin againe, but after another fashion: to wit, by deuising a certaine newe association, &c.* Did these men (who were thus frustrated at Rome by *F. Parsons his dealing there*) know that *Fa. Parsons was come to Rome*, trow yee? If they did know thereof, and were in England before *Fishers* departure from England, how was it *unknownen there at his departure thence, that F. Parsons was come to Rome*? If they knew thereof, but were not as yet come into England, before *Fishers* departure from thence, how did *Fisher*



goe *seuen or eight times from the North parts to Wisbich, Cambridge, and London, about the affaire he speaketh of, in which the association had caused diuersitie of opinions?* For if this author be an honest man, those men, who were said in his first Chapter fol. 6. and 7. to haue bene *frustrated (as they thought) by F. Parsons dealing in Rome, resolved to begin againe by deuising a certaine new association, &c.* But perchance Fisher dreamed, that hee was employed in such businesse in England, and how that he had *a swan at a banquet in Wisbich, and lay at London with M. Charnocke and M. Heburne, and much other good newes.* And this author putteth downe his dreame, as an authenticall testimonie, for want of other stuffe. And if hee had not dreamed himselfe, when hee set it downe, doubtlesse hee would haue omitted so much at the least, as (if one dreamer may conuince another of falshood) conuinceth him most manifestly of fault in his relation of the *beginning of the association, set downe in his first chapter, as we haue noted.* But by this (saith the *Apologie*) *any indifferent man may see, how matters stand, and where the ground of all troubles and dissenstions lyeth. All is but a conspiracie of euill humors, against them that doe better then themselves, and euery man that loueth his soule will soonc descric the same. Religion is not sought by this faction, but reuenge and satisfaction of bad appetites.* This wrote he, who knew well what he said, although his vngratioufnesse would haue his reader apply it to others, and not to him, who deserued it, as hath bene shewed: and will still appeare in euery chapter more clearely then other. And in this vaine he telleth his reader, that his Holines *cleerely perceiuing, tooke order first in the Romane colledge (which belongeth to another place) and then in England for remedie thereof, as hereafter you shall heare.* And so he setteth himselfe to the eight chapter, where at the very first he doth notably abuse his reader, as shall be shewed, and he conuincd of most manifest falshood, and to be a chiefe man in the conspiracie of euill humours, against such men as sought religion with the greatest hazard of their liues, when he and his fellowes were idle lookers on, and would be no actors, vntil room was made for their fatherhoods.



C H A P. 13.

*How the Author of the Apologie to cloake the Iesuits their dealings concerning the institution of the new Subordination, perswadeth his Reader that his Holines was moued thereto by certaine letters which were long after written.*  
Apol. cap. 8.

**I**N the 8. Chapter of the *Apologie* the author proposeth to handle how his Holines hearing of the former disorders, and contentions, did resolve to make a *Subordination* in England, and how it was ordained, and intimated by the *Protector*, & called in question by some discōtented brethren, without reason, or authoritie: and how great troubles haue ensued thereof. And first he beginneth to declare the motiues, or causes of this *Subordination* in this maner.

*When his Holines heard the former state of matters in England, Flanders, and other places, and of the murmurations of some against the Fathers of the Societie, set downe as well in the aforesaid contumelious Memoriall, as by diuers other letters and relations, which came to the Protectors sight, and by him was related to his Holines, and namely when he receiued great store of priuate, and publique letters, out of England against the said Memoriall of Fisher, and some one with aboue 100. hands at it: ether with 40. and 50. all in fauour, and commendation of the Fathers; their labours, and behauour in England, against the said slanderous Memoriall. And in the margin there is this note: See the letters of the Northern Priests 24. Martij 1598, and others 20. of April, and others after 30. Iuly. And others of the South in great number 18 of May, and of the quiet sort of Wisbich. 27. of March 1598. it followeth in the text, and many other in seuerall letters of principall men, which are yet extant, (but are not yet to be seene) when also diuers of these did expressly demand some subordination, and gouernment of Secular Priests to take away this emulation of some few against the Fathers, (as though all but a few, would haue had them to haue bene their masters) and that two lately came out of England, at this very time, one a Iesuit, the other a Secular Priest (bate me an ace, quoth he, for M.*



*Standish* had giuen his name before, to become a *Iesuite*, and therefore a vassaile of theirs, although he retained still the habite of a *Secular* priest, that vnder that habit he might the more cunningly deceiue his Holines) *each of them vrging the same in behalfe of the one, and other order,* (a couple of fit Proctors for the purpose.) But when all this was done, What then? Forfooth his Holines, after mature deliberation resolved to yeeld thereunto, hoping hereby to quiet all, as well for that the *Secular* priests should by this meanes, haue gouernours of their owne, as also for that the Fathers by all likelihood should remaine free from all matter of calumniation about gouerning *Secular* priests for the time to come. How currant would this tale be, if one of the most necessary matters there, were not, that the Archpriest must aduise still with the *Iesuits* in his greatest affaires? for so he is commanded in his instructions; and consequently, the Fathers by all likelihood, do not remaine free from all maner of calumniation, as he termeth it, about gouerning *Secular* priests. And doubtlesse if it be a calumniation, to say, the Fathers do gouerne the *Secular* priests, what is it when they are not said to gouerne, but doe really gouerne, by order as is said from his Holines in great matters, and of their owne great deuotion in all other by the Archpriest his blinde obedience vnto them?

But now to the maine *motiue* of this *Subordination*, and that which caused his Holines to consult for some moneths, and to seeke for informations out of England (of the quiet at the least) for the fittest men for gouernment, (as this author immediatly suggesteth) we must conceiue some such strange miracle; as that there was some extraordinary day, weeke, or moneth, in which this *motiue* was made, consultation had, and information giuen. In this chapter fol. 102. it is confessed: and if it were not, it would bee otherwise prooued, that the Cardinals letters, by which the authority was instituted, did beare date the seuenth of *March*, in the yeere 1598. This then being dispatched at that time, what time would a reasonable man haue allowed for the trauailing of the *motiues* thereof out of England to Rome? How many wil he gesse those moneths to be which are here said by this author, that his Hol. tooke to consult, and to haue intelligence from the quiet in England, of the fittest men for gouernment, and could  
heare



heare but of seuen in all England, wherof one was dead, to wit, M.D.Henshaw? The sunne, who kept his course in England, and saw how the Iesuites were calumniated, as men, that would *gouerne the Secular priests*, stayed his course at Rome, for the space of fīue, or sixe moneths.

And whereas the Romanes had gotten the start of vs in England for some tenne dayes in the course of the yeere, now the English had gotten the start of them, and made their *seuenth* day of *March*, come many moneths after ours. For as it is sayd, this authoritie was made at Rome vpon the *seuenth* of *March* 1598: and it was made vpon certaine *informations* (as appeareth here in the margent fol. 98.) which were sent out of England, some the 24 of *March*, some the 27, some the 20 of *April*, some the 18 of *May*, some the 30 of *Iuly*, in the same yere 1598, to which if we should allow a time for the *motiues* to tra-uaile to Rome, and *some moneths* for his Holinesse to consult, and send backe againe into England for *informations of the fittest men for gouernement*, I trowe the same would haue rested himselfe well at Rome, (howsoeuer hee laboured elsewhere) to haue an authoritie instituted vpon these *motiues*, *consultations*, and *informations*, vpon the *seuenth* of *March*, at Rome in the same yere 1598. And least that they should bee idle at Rome any time of this long day: In Rome also (saith this Author) the opinions were asked by the Protector of the principall English, that resided there, and could best informe: as namely Father Parsons that had often ad-vice from thence, (from his fellow Iesuits, and therefore could the better informe for his owne purpose) Fa. Baldwin, lately come from England (a iolly bold yong fellow, but a Iesuite, and therefore a principal man) M.D.Haddocke, M.Martin Array (whose fayrest game was to please the Iesuits) M. James Strandish (who had giuen his name to the Iesuits to become one of their Order) and others that had laboured in the English vineyard, (perchance Fa. Warford, who was become also a Iesuite, and helped to make vp a very fit Iurie to passe vpon the priests) as also M. Thomas Allen, nephew to the late Cardinall, and diuers else (not worthy the naming, yet might very well be of the Councell, the plot was so wise'y cast) who concurring with the opinion of letters comming out of England (hee hath before told you what



letters, and when they were written: some of them in *Aprill*, some in *May*, some in *Iuly*) as also with diuers other principall men that wrote thereof from *Spaine*, *Flanders*, and other places (some diuine intelligencers) both of the necessitie of some Subordination to be made (they had belike vnderstood of the Iesuits their ambitious humor wherewith they had begun to trouble all England: namely about their insolent *Agencie* in *Wisbich*, where who would not subiect himselfe to a Iesuite, was to be defamed as a loose companion, or *libertine*, and be starued to death, and sufficiencie of *M Blackwels* person, with the helpe perchance of the Iesuites, for such is his sixt *Instruction*. *Et licet Superior ille ex cōsultoribus Archipresbyteri non sit, quia tamen summopere expedit, sua Sanctitas id omnino cupit, atq; precipit, vt inter patres, & sacerdotes summa sit animorum unio, ac consensio: Et quia dictus Superior pro sua in rebus Angliae experientia, pro eaq;, quam apud Catholicos habet, autoritate, plurimum poterit ad omnes Sacerdotum consultationes adiumenti afferre, curabit Archipresbyter in rebus maioribus iudicium quoq; eius, conciliumq; exquirere, vt omnia euidentius, ac maiore luce ac pace ad diuinam gloriam dirigantur: That is, And although that Superiour (of the Iesuites) bee none of the counsell of the Archpriest, that is, of his twelue assistants, who were appointed to aduise the Archpriest, but are vsed onely as informers, and are furthest off from him, yet because it is very expedient, his Holinesse also doth altogether desire, yea, and command, that there be the greatest union that may be, and agreement betweene the Fathers (the Iesuits) and the Priests. And because this sayd Superiour (of the Iesuits) both by reason of his experience in the affaires of England, and of the authority which he carieth among the Catholics, can very much further all the consultations of the priests, the Archpr. shall haue care to seeke for his iudgement, and counsell in matters of greatest waight, to the end that al things may more ordinate-ly, and with greater light, and peace bee directed to the glory of God (almost a threedbare worne cloake to couer any disorder) Nowe that he hath declared vpon what *motiues* his Holinesse resolved to make a *Subordination*, hee descendeth to more particulars, and telleth his Reader that vpon the aduise of these iollie Counsellors, (all Iesuites, so farre as we know, except *M. Thomas Allen*, whose name is here set, for the more credit of this*



this consistory, because he was nephew to the late Cardinall) his Holines resolved according to their opinions and informations in these two points, (marke I pray you, what this author attributeth to his Holines in this subordination) to wit, to appoint a gouernment: and that this man should be the gouernour: though for the third point (that is) about the kinde or manner of gouernment, hee iudged not expedient for the present, to appoint any other but an Archpriest, an ancient dignitie in the Church of Christ. This then, by this authors relation, was the vtmost which his Holines resolved, to wit, that the kind or manner of gouernment, should bee no other, then what is vnder that ancient dignitie of the Church: namely of an Archpriest. Consequently his Holines appointed no other subiection or subordination, then such as is to an Archpriest: we are therefore to see, what belongeth to the office of an Archpriest, and in that onely (according to his Holinesse appointment) we are to obey M. Blackwels person, and in no other. For such are this authors words: though for the third, about the kind and manner of gouernment, he iudged not expedient for the present to appoint any other but an Archpriest: whose office whosoever will seeke in the Canons of the Church, he shall find to be in another kind, then this of M. Blackwels is, as it is instituted by the Cardinall in his Holines name: for so also is it here confessed in the words immediatly following, *Lest if hee (the Pope) should haue begunne with Bishops, hee doubted very probably, that it would haue caused some great motion in England: for auoiding whereof, he resolved also for this first time, not to write himselfe any Apostolicall letters* (note here the folly and malice of the Iesuites and others, who writ or approoued that scandalous Libell of *Schisme*: in which the Priests were condemned of *schisme, sedition, faction*, and denounced to bee *excommunicated, irregular, fallen from the Church, as Southsayers and Idolaters, Ethnickes and Publicans*: and for what? For resisting Apostolicall decrees, when there was none, but to commit rather the institution of the matter by speciall order to the Protector, to be done in his (the Popes) name. And how agreeth this with the Cardinals letter, where wee reade these words in the Cardinals own name: *Dum hac nostra ordinatio durauerit: so long as this our ordinance shall remaine?* And all that followeth concerning the Archpriest his subdelegation,



gation, and faculties, or forme, which he was to keepe in the exercise of his subdelegation. But his Holinesse sayth afterwards in his *Breue* of the sixt of *April*, that all was done by him. Be it so. What is this to the purpose? the priests doe not now call that in question, nor euer did since the time, that they first saw that *Breue*. Where is then the difficultie? *Whether the priests were Schismatikes, seditious, factious, excommunicated, fallen from the Church, as Ethnicks, Publicans, Sorcerers, and Idolaters,* in that they did not yeeld their obedience to a *Superiour*, sayd to haue bene instituted by his Holines: but not proued otherwise then by the bare testimony of a Cardinal in a letter to the same man, who was to become a *Superior*: which letter beareth date the seuenth of *March* 1598: and it was more then a yeere before the Popes letters were written, as appeareth by their date, which is the sixt of *April* 1599. And the foolish *blind obedient* must beleue you, and vse Catholike priests like *schismatikes*, who in the space betweene the seuenth of *March* in the yeere 1598, and the sixt of *April* 1599, did resist (as they are tolde, and will not vnderstand any other) the Popes order, and decrees.

*Loe here then* (saith this author) *the grounds of thus his Holines resolution, so farre as we are informed by them, that were priuy thereunto.* Loe then say I, how sottishly the Iesuits vrged a resisting of *Apostolicall decrees*, before the Pope resolved to write himselfe any *Apostolicall letters*. And by this (saith he) are ouerthrowen all these *cauillations*. And by this (say I) is ouerthrowen that malicious Libel which was fathered by Iesuits, and fostered by the *Archpriest*, and all his seditious adherents, wherein the priests were concluded to be *Schismaticks, excommunicated, fallen from Gods Church, &c.* as resisters of the Popes decrees, when there was none made, as here it is confessed in the *Apologie*: And *suspitious coniectures* (saith he) which our discontented brethren in their last bookes haue set foorth, about this meaning as well of his Holines, & the Protector, as of those also that gaue informations for procuring of this authority, sinisterly interpreting the one, and the other. There could be no *suspitious coniectures* of his Holines meaning. For as here it is confessed, his Holines declared nothing in a yeere after, that he had any meaning, or knowledge of this Superioritie,



perioritie, instituted by the Cardinall: the *Protectors* meaning not being knowen otherwise, then by his proceedings in the institution of this auctority, did minister cause of suspicion, that he knew not what he did. The meaning of the *informers*, for procuring this authoritie (being not knowen to be any other men, then Iesuits, & confessed to be those *fol. 99.* by this author, to wit, *Fa. Parsons, F. Baldwine, D. Haddocke, M. Martin Array, M. James Standish*) might without offence be subiect to a suspicious coniecture; cōsidering the canuas, which the Iesuits had made for a Superioritie ouer the priests in *Wisbich*, vnder the name of an *Agencie*. And whereas here is mentioned sometime, that *Catholicks desired some* subordination, sometime that *the priests*, there are no other particulars set downe, then certaine letters, which were al written long after, that the *Subordination* was instituted: neither can they bring any, as in reason may be iudged, by their so long concealing them, (the sight of them being more materiall, then all their *Apologie*) vnlesse they will bring foorth some of those letters, which were taken from *M. Bishop*, and *M. Charnocke* at Rome, & abuse them: affirming, that they were sent before by some others for such a purpose. For when the priests determined vpon the erecting of their *Association*, they had the petitions to his Holines of many aswell of the ancientest priests, as other: some in general termes for some *Subordination*, some to haue his allowance for their ioyning particularly in that maner, as they wished, vnder a head, and such *Rules* as were proposed: and some of these were written before this *Subordination* was made, as is confessed in the 5. article of the *Libel*, which was put vp at Rome to the Cardinall *Casietan*, and *Burghesius* vpon the 17. of February 1599. in the English Colledge, which also demonstrateth, how false the imputation is *fol 100*, that without all *Superiors* auctoritie, they (the priests) would haue set vp their *Association*.

But marke, I pray you, how this fellow goeth onwards in this narration, and you shal quickly find where his shooe did wring him. For so long, (saith he) as our Clergie proceeded in the Spirit of humilitie, obediēce, peace, & vnitie, there was no need of Superior: for that euery one was a rule, and law to himselfe. Where was this defect of humilitie, obedience, peace, & vnitie? or in whō? If con-



tention for superioritie be an argument of pride, then was this defect in the Iesuits and not in the priests. For as all the world knoweth, the Iesuits sought a Superioritie in *Wibich* over the Secular priests. Or if they wil stoutly stand vpon it, that it was thrust vpon them: yet they must confesse, that it was most followed by such as were secretly Iesuits, as *F. Bickley, F. Bolton, F. Archer*, and who els. And that when it grew to a marueilous tempest, the Iesuits persisted still in their course, or canuas for the superiority, vnder the title of an *Agencie*; neither was there any disobedience euer noted in any of the priests, but to *F. Weston* the Iesuit, and first vsurper in *Wibich*, which was not to be called a disobedience, but a resisting rather of his ambitious humor, and his fellowes: who laboured, notwithstanding the scandal which came thereof, to make him *Superior* ouer the Secular priests living then in the *Castle*: by which, peace was broken, and a most sinfull diuision begun, so farre foorth, as those factious innouators would not eate with those priests, who would not subiect themselves vnto the Iesuit. But (saith this author) *crescente numero discipulorum, factum est murmur Græcorum aduersus Hebræos, &c.* when the multitude of our priests encreased, and the former spirit in many of them decreased, then begun presently murmuration, and emulation against the Fathers of the Societie, as though they onely did hinder vs, who indeed were, and are the men, that doe principally helpe vs both in word, & life; so long as we were content to learne. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*, We would not be contented to learne any longer of the Iesuits. If this fellow had ment honestly, he would haue cited a litle more of the text of Scripture. But then perchance it would haue made against him more, then he would his simple Reader should vnderstand. He taketh as much as he listeth to apply, & leaueth out the rest: yet doeth he falsly apply also that which he bringeth. For in our case the *Priests* were the *Hebrues*, for they came first into this haruest: and the *Iesuits* must be these murmuring *Græcians*, who came in after vs: and the Iesuits not being contented with their fellowlike State with the priests, must become forsooth, *M. Agents*, and take charge of the priests, whether they wil or no; as in their vproare at *Wibich* was manifest to all the beholders. But now to that which this authour concealed vnder an  
*&c.*



*etc.* In the text it followeth, *eo quod despicerentur in ministerio quotidiano viduae eorum*: because their widowes were despised, or contemned in the daily service, which used to be performed by widowes in those times. And by this it would haue bene apparant, that the pride of the Iesuits had bene the cause of this *murmuration*, and our peace broken vpon their foolish selfe conceite, that they were not *sicut ceteri homines*, as other men. But note I pray you, how the text is turned, from a *despising* or *contemning*, to a conceite, that the priests were hindered by the Iesuites. It is also further to be obserued, that when the multitude of Priests were great, and the number of the Iesuites very small, the Priests and the Iesuites conferred together, and great peace was betweene them. But when the number of the Iesuites encreased, that they began to conceiue a hope of Superioritie, & to bring the Secular priests into a slavish bondage vnder them, they began to take exceptions against the priests, and the more wicked and sinfull the slanderer was, the more vnited he was to the Iesuites. And no other remedie must be vsed, but a *Subordination* to a Iesuit, to keepe the priests in order. And this was thought fit, to be first attempted at *Wishich*, where the priests liuing vpon the almes, which Catholikes sent thither, might be enforced therunto by the Catholikes there, withdrawing their charitie from them: to which purpose the Iesuites friends imployed themselves abroad. But some comming out of the Seminaries (saith this Authour) where they had liued vnder the Iesuites, with lesse, or worse Spirit, then were to be wished, drew other to emulate them, whom before they had obeyed. This emulation would be expressed: The Priests affirme, that the Iesuites pride and ambition was the cause of all the stirre in England, and for prooffe they bring their attempt at *Wishich*, before which time all was in quiet. And as some priests did sometimes obey some Iesuites, as Rectors of Colleges, where they were brought vp: so are there many in England, who neuer obeyed any Iesuite. Neither doth this argument prooue, that they should euer after obey the same men, much lesse that they should obey all other, who are of that order: yet must this be the argument, which is foolishly here insinuated by this authour, or else none. For of al the Iesuits in England there are none, whom these priests



obeied at any time, in any place. Besids that they are al of them inferiour to many priests, both for age, learning, wisedome, gouernment, and what els belongeth to men. But by this hath this authour shewed, what his meaning is: that forsooth, because some Priests haue obeyed some Iesuities, therefore all priests must be obedient to any of the Iesuits: yea although he be one, who immediatly before he became a Iesuite, had scant the wit to keepe himselfe cleane. But for the auoyding of this emulation *it seemed* (saith this authour) *in all good mens opinions, and the Iesuites about the rest* (or els all is marred, when you talke of good men) *that the onely, or chiefe remedie would be, to haue this subordination of Secular priests among themselves*: but so as the *Superiour* must be at the Iesuites direction, as both his instructions, and his practise declare. And then followeth a prooffe out of a letter of 6. Assistants, to cleare the Iesuits from the procuring of this *subordination*, against or without the will of the Secular Clergie, which testimonie, if the *vnited Priests* were the authours of, the *Apologie* is as cleare, as that, of which one requested to haue, either his fellow asked, or himselfe, if he were a thiefe. This testimony also harpeth vpon the *long day* at Rome, of which we spake before, and of the wonders wrought thereupon the 7. of *March*, by certaine letters dated in England in *April*, *May*, and *Iuly* following. Of this letter we shal haue occasion to say more in a particular answer thereunto. And here we will leaue the Reader to wonder onely at this marginall note, fol. 101. *See the letter of sixe Ancient priests the 17. of September 1597.* For he telleth not, where this letter is to be seene, but rather leaueth a suspition, that it is yet to be deuised, vnlesse he thought it too worthy a thing to be inserted among so many foolish and frivolous impertinencies, as with which this *Apologie* doth swarme. The prooffe also which followeth, that *Fa Parsons* laboured to haue Bishops in England, is most absurd in their vnderstanding, who knowe how he can play on both sides, and impugne that in which he would seem to be most forward: he can send notes of such things, as hee would pretend a desire should be kept secret, and send them round about the world with the same desire of secrecie. He can write his letters in exceeding great commendations to one of  
some



some one man, and at the same time write to another, in the dispraise of the same man. And is it a sufficient disproofe of his backwardnesse of hauing Bishops, that he laboured with some to haue them in England? Can *Fa. Parsons* so farre ouershoot himselfe, as to make his credite so small in the Court of Rome, as that any thing can be denied him, being assisted by such as expect from him a kingdome or two for their seruice?

Well (saith the *Apologie*) this then being resolved by his Holines, that he would haue an Archpriest appointed in England, whom all the rest should obey, he gaue commission to the said Cardinall Protector to institute the same in his name. Howe was this made knowne to the Priests? Forsooth the Cardinall shewed, that it was his Holinesse especiall order and commandement by these words, *Speciali mandato nobis iniunxit*; his Holines hath ordained this vnto vs by a speciall commandement. What silly boy would thus haue Englished *iniunxit* in this place? or what is that *This*, which his Holinesse ordained by a speciall commandement? the institution of this subordination with these faculties &c. could this man imagine, that the Cardinals letters would neuer againe be looked on? or if he could feare that, could he be so impudent, as to cite this part thereof, for to prooue his Holinesse speciall commandement for the erecting of the Archpriest? And to prooue, that his Holinesse was moued by the aforesaid reasons, alleaged by him, to wit, *emulation*, and what els pleaseth him: he citeth these words out of the same letter of the Cardinall: *Rationes ab ipsis sacerdotibus redditae, &c.* the reasons alleaged by priests for this matter, were allowed by his Holinesse: and afterwardes he citeth a great part of the letter, for so much as concerneth the commendations of the Iesuits: and the desire which the Pope hath, that the Iesuites, and the Priests might liue in peace together. Which (saith he) comming from so high a superiour, and directly from Christs vicar himselfe, we doe wonder, how it tooke no more effect within the heartes of our brethren, that impugned the same. And our brethren wonder, that any man can bee so impudent, as to make such a wonder; confessing so often as he doth in this *Apologie*, that Christs vicar himselfe would not write at all: whereby neither his letters appeared for the institution of this Archpriest, nor any commission by which the Cardinall



had power to doe it. But the Cardinal his word was sufficient (saith he) and *our brethren* say no, and proue it by the testimonie of all men of knowledge in the Canon and Ciuill lawes: who say, *that the sole testimonie of a Cardinall, is not necessarily to be credited in any matter preiudiciall to a third person*: yet must the *blinde obedient* beleue, that the priests in not obeying the Cardinals letters, did *directly withstand Christs vicar himselfe*. But after he hath cited a part of the Cardinals letter, he affirmeth, that all was confirmed afterwards by his Holines owne *Breue*: and that all written by the Cardinall, and euery parcell thereof, was by his order, consent, proper motion, and commandement, written, ordained, and sent into England. And to this *our brethren* answer, that so soone as they sawe this, they did presently submit themselues vnto the order. And say moreover, that this is very foolishly brought in, to prooue a disobedience in them, before this *Breue* was written. And by this is answer made to the question following. *But what? did this satisfie or quiet them, that had resolved to be vnquiet?* For the priests perceiuing such a deuise of the Iesuits, & foreseeing how hereby the Iesuits might vnder a maske play their prizes more boldly then before, sent to Rome, as became Catholike priests, to know his Hol. pleasure, & in the meane while, these who were *resolved to be vnquiet*, spread Libels abroad against the priests, and condemned them of *schisme*, & much more such religious stufte. The causes which moued the priests to demur vpon the matters, vntill they saw his Hol *Breue*, are set downe at large by M. Io. Collington in his booke intituled *A iust defence &c.* whi. her we are to referre our Reader: and as for the letter of the 6. *Assistants*, it shall haue his place elsewhere, to be answered, & for now, we let it passe, as a base profe of any thing, which is therein affirmed, it being (no doubt) penned by those, who are interested in this *Apologie*. Neither doe the letters of fortie or fiftie priests in England egged on, and in a manner compelled therunto by the Iesuits and Archpriest, to approoue his authority, or giue thanks to his Holines for it, prooue any thing, but a lightnesse in them, to giue credit where it was not due, even in a most preiudiciall matter against themselues. The praises which are here attributed to M. *Blackwels* person, no man wisheth



eth more he may deſerue, then I doe: but the teſtimonie which is brought of his falſe dealing, when he firſt manifeſted his authoritie, will goe hard againſt him: and the harder, for the poore ſhifts which are vſed in this *Apologie*, fol. 109. to ſalue them. This author hauing prooued a reſolution in the Pope, and layd downe the ſuppoſed reaſons of the inſtitution of this *ſubordination*, and concluded, that the prieſts were diſobedient to *Chriſts Vicar himſelfe*, yet not hauing the wit to conceale, that his Holines did not write himſelfe any thing, vntil a yeere after, and more: (at the ſight of which letters, the prieſts did inſtantly ſubmit themſelues) hee goeth about now to ſalue the reaſons which the prieſts haue giuen in their bookes, of their forbearance, vntill they ſaw his Holines *Breue*: and telleth his Reader, that hee hath gathered them out of both the two late bookes, the one in *Engliſh*, the other in *Latine*, though *confuſedly and tumultuoſly* let downe in both; and in no one place *diſtinctly* and *in order*: whereby perchance hee might haue deſerued ſome commendation for his good will, had he not marred all himſelfe in this *Apologie*, chap. 2. fol. 18. where hee taketh notice of one and twentie reaſons, which are *diſtinctly* and *in order ſet downe* in the *Engliſh* booke, and citeth the pages 84, 85, 86, & *deinceps*: and chap. 11. fol. 176. hee acknowledgeth the ſame 21. reaſons to be laid together by *diſtinct* numbers.

The firſt reaſon which this author impugneth is, *that it was gotten by wrong and falſe information, by the inſtance of the aduerſe partie onely, againſt their willes, and without their knowledge, contrary to allequitie and iuſtice*: And this hee impugneth, by affirming, that he hath already ſhewed it to be falſe, but you muſt goe looke where. The reaſon is defended by M. Doctor *Ely* in his notes vpon the eight chapter of this *Apologie*, pag 226. and other following; and by M. *John Collington* in his firſt reaſon.

*Secondly* (ſaith this author) *they alledge, that they doubted whether this ordination came from the Pope himſelfe or no, ſeeing there came no Breue, nor Bull*. Their reaſon is, for that the Pope vſeth to ſend his *Breues* or *Bulls* in matters of leſſe weight then this is, as appeareth by that extrauagant *Ininnēta nobis, de electione*: where all men are forbidden to receiue leſſe prelacies then this was: although this were the meanest title that any prelat hath,  
as



had power to doe it. But the Cardinal his word was sufficient (saith he) and *our brethren* say no, and proue it by the testimonie of all men of knowledge in the Canon and Ciuill lawes: who say, *that the sole testimonie of a Cardinall, is not necessarily to be credited in any matter preiudiciall to a third person*: yet must the *blinde obedient* beleue, that the priests in not obeying the Cardinals letters, did *directly withstand Christs vicar himselfe*. But after he hath cited a part of the Cardinals letter, he affirmeth, that all was confirmed afterwards by his Holines owne *Breue*: and that all written by the Cardinall, and euery parcell thereof, was by his order, consent, proper motion, and commandement, written, ordained, and sent into England. And to this *our brethren* answer, that so soone as they sawe this, they did presently submit themselues vnto the order. And say moreover, that this is very foolishly brought in, to prooue a disobedience in them, before this *Breue* was written. And by this is answer made to the question following. *But what? did this satisfie or quiet them, that had resolved to be vnquiet?* For the priests perceiuing such a deuise of the Iesuits, & foreseeing how hereby the Iesuits might vnder a maske play their prizes more boldly then before, sent to Rome, as became Catholike priests, to know his Hol. pleasure, & in the meane while, these who were *resolved to be vnquiet*, spread Libels abroad against the priests, and condemned them of *schisme*, & much more such religious stufte. The causes which moued the priests to demur vpon the matters, vntill they saw his Hol *Breue*, are set downe at large by M. *Io. Collington* in his booke intituled *A iust defence &c.* whi. her we are to referre our Reader: and as for the letter of the 6. *Assistants*, it shall haue his place elsewhere, to be answered, & for now, we let it passe, as a base profe of any thing, which is therein affirmed, it being (no doubt) penned by those, who are interested in this *Apologie*. Neither doe the letters of fortie or fiftie priests in England egged on, and in a manner compelled therunto by the Iesuits and Archpriest, to approoue his authority, or giue thanks to his Holines for it, prooue any thing, but a lightnesse in them, to giue credit where it was not due, euen in a most preiudiciall matter against themselues. The praises which are here attributed to M. *Blackwels* person, no man wisheth



eth more he may deſerue, then I doe: but the teſtimonie which is brought of his falſe dealing, when he firſt manifeſted his authoritie, will goe hard againſt him: and the harder, for the poore ſhifts which are vſed in this *Apologie*, fol. 109. to ſalue them. This author hauing prooued a reſolution in the Pope, and layd downe the ſuppoſed reaſons of the inſtitution of this *ſubordination*, and concluded, that the prieſts were diſobedient to *Chriſts Vicar himſelfe*, yet not hauing the wit to conceale, that his Holines did not write himſelfe any thing, vntil a yeere after, and more: (at the ſight of which letters, the prieſts did inſtantly ſubmit themſelues) hee goeth about now to ſalue the reaſons which the prieſts haue giuen in their bookes, of their forbearance, vntill they ſaw his Holines *Breue*: and telleth his Reader, that hee hath gathered them out of both the two late bookes, the one in *Engliſh*, the other in *Latine*, though *confuſedly and tumultuoſly* let downe in both; and in no one place *diſtinctly* and *in order*: whereby perchance hee might haue deſerued ſome commendation for his good will, had he not marred all himſelfe in this *Apologie*, chap. 2. fol. 18. where hee taketh notice of one and twentie reaſons, which are *diſtinctly* and *in order* ſet downe in the *Engliſh* booke, and citeth the pages 84, 85, 86, & *deinceps*: and chap. 11. fol. 176. hee acknowledgeth the ſame 21. reaſons to be laid together by *diſtinct* numbers.

The firſt reaſon which this author impugneſh is, *that it was gotten by wrong and falſe information, by the inſtance of the aduerſe partie onely, againſt their willes, and without their know ledge, contrary to allequitie and iuſtice*: And this hee impugneſh, by affirming, that he hath already ſhewed it to be falſe, but you muſt goe looke where. The reaſon is defended by M. Doctour Ely in his notes vpon the eight chapter of this *Apologie*, pag 226. and other following; and by M. Iohn Collington in his firſt reaſon.

*Secondly* (ſaith this author) *they alledge, that they doubted whether this ordination came from the Pope himſelfe or no, ſeeing there came no Breue, nor Bull*. Their reaſon is, for that the Pope vſeth to ſend his *Breues* or *Bulls* in matters of leſſe weight then this is, as appeareth by that extrauagant *Ininncta nobis, de electione*: where all men are forbidden to receiue leſſe prelacies then this was: although this were the meanest title that any prelat hath,  
as



as is handled at large by M. Collington in his 4. Reason, pa. 138, 139, and 140: and M. Do. Ely, pag 141. to 149. whereabout they aske this question concerning us: *Why should they be so unwilling to procure, or suffer to be procured, some Bull or Breue for the confirmation thereof, if it came from his Holinesse?* Here were so many tales told of the united Priests, which labour well and zealously also, chap. 3. fol. 28. and chap. 8 fol. 105. but what now, the good and obedient: and such like arguments of the quiet, their dwelling farre from good neighbours, that the rope brake, and downe tell the Iesuits. Whereabout (sayth this author) they (the priests) aske this question concerning us: wee must goe see concerning whome this question was asked, and assoile this riddle, *Who is the author of this Apologie?* and for the greater euidence, we will set downe the priests words, in the place cited by this author out of *The copies of discourses*, pag 4. and 5. And more to shew their (the Iesuits) intentions in this matter, what interest they seeke and challenge in this authoritie (though indeed nothing concerning them, because a distinct societie and body from us) one of them (and in the margent we reade Fa. Garnet) in a letter hee wrote vnto one that would not subscribe, confesseth and acknowledgeth, that whatsoeuer is opposite to the reuerend Archpriest, must of force be consequently opposite and against them; which thing must of necessitie import an extraordinarie tie betwene the authoritie of the Archpriest and them: either of the subordination of them to the Archpriest, which they disclaime from and denie; or contrariwise of the Archp. to them: Els how must it of necessity follow, that he which is opposite vnto the Archp. authority, must of force be opposite to them, as though a man might not resist their superior of an order, but he must needs thereby oppose himselfe against the whole body of another order? Furthermore if their interest were not great in this authority, why should they be so unwilling to procure, or suffer to be procured some Bul, or Breue for the confirmation thereof? Now tel me, Concerning who is this question asked? If ye be Iesuits (who are authors of this *Apologie*) why doe ye maske your selues with the name of *Priests united in due Subordination to the Archpriest*? If ye are secular priests, tell me, How doth this question concerne you? The author of this *Apologie* was not mindfull of the weaknesse of the Rope, by breaking whereof he caughted so foule a fall. The matter being  
layd



layd downe so plaine before you assoile this hard riddle, *concerning whom is this question asked? Why should there not &c.* Will you for shame answere as the poore fellow did to this question, *Who was Iaphets father?* being no plainer taught, that Noe had three sonnes, *Shem, Cham, and Iaphet*, then you are taught in this place by you cited, that *this question was asked concerning the Iesuits?* Well then, hereafter we must take either the Iesuits to be meant by your words *concerning vs*, and consequently one of them to haue made this *Apologie*, or *Troll*, *Tom Millers* bitch. But what? doth this authors folly cease with this? *no God wot*, (to vse his owne phrase *fol. 104.*) but he giueth a like answere to the question which the priests did aske, and this is it: *but this question, and reason thereon depending is now answered:* and how? for that a *Breue* was procured: but when? aboue a yeere after, as appeareth by the date, but when the priests did aske the question, how was it then to bee answered? they knowe now, that there is a *Breue* procured, and they all submitted themselves readily vnto it, as is witnessed in this *Apologie*. And in the last *Breue* of the seuenteenth of *August 1601*, to the manifest reprouing of this authors falshood, who in this place affirmeth, *that it was not much more esteemed by these men (the priests) then these the Cardinals letters.* but marke I pray you this prooffe, *as appeared by the effect:* what effect? forsooth, the priests would not suffer themselves to be abused, and reported to haue been *schismatickes* as the Iesuits published, after the comming of the *Breue*, and the peace made: and the Archpriest did not onely not controll this seditious attempt of the Iesuits, but furthered it by promulgating a resolution which hee sayd he had receiued from the mother Citie, that the priests were *schismatickes*, who refused to obey the authoritie before they sawe the *Breue*. And what els? *And that they in this very booke do call it in question also, how it came forth, saying, that they doe not know out of what office it was procured by Fa. Parsons meanes.* Is this to call the *Breue* in question, or rather the maner of procuring it? He who vsed the wordes, out of which this clause is gathered, declareth in the Pamphlet, intituled, *The hope of peace* pag. 23. that a *Breue* may come from diuers places, & be called an *Apostolical Breue*: and pag 24. he giueth a cause why there might be some ielou-



he had of indirect dealing, in the procuring of this: to wit, a manifest mistaking of the Cardinals letter, which is also noted in the booke to the *Inquisition* pag. 59: a thing not vnusuall in his Holines Breues.

Other reasons of theirs are (sayth the *Apologie*) that the Cardinals letters Patents are not sufficient to giue the matter credit: and this is sufficiently prooued by M. Io B. in *The hope of peace* pag. 32. 33. and since by M. Iohn Collington in his third reason, pag. 60. 61. and other following. M. Doctor Ely also, Doctor of both lawes, and professor in *Pont à mussion* in Lorraine, in his notes vpon the *Apologie* from the 116 page to the 137. prooueth this point: where also that foolish obiection of the eighth priuiledge of a Card. here cited in the *Apologie*, is answered: as also by M. Iohn Collington pag. 114. and the authour of the *Apologie* iustly reprooued for his false dealing in citing this impertinent glosse: for he leaueth out a part of the sentence, which marreth his market, and maketh it euident, to what poore straits he is driuen, that must cite such a place for himselfe: which besides that it maketh not for his purpose, it maketh altogether against him, in calling that in doubt, vpon which hee would build his argument which he would frame in this maner: The credit of a Card. is so great, that if he should say, he is the Popes Legate, he is to be beleeued, though he shew no letters: *ergo* in this, as a matter of lesse moment, he is to bee beleeued. If a debtor tell his creditor he is a Christian, his creditor will beleue him: but if he telleth him that he oweth him nothing, I doubt whether he will beleue him, notwithstanding he beleueeth him in a farre greater matter then forty shillings, to wit, that he is a Christian. But to their argument. First it is to bee seene, that it is not infallibly true, nor so taken generally, that such credit is giuen to a Cardinall: For the same glosse in the same place affirmeth, that some do doubt thereof. And M. D. Ely affirmeth, that it may be better said, that all do doubt thereof. and so he goeth on pag 125. vpon this point, shewing vpon how weake a prooffe this *Apologie* standeth. and M. Iohn Collington prooueth pag 118. that he to whom a cause is delegated by *speciall commandement*, is greater in the same, then is a Legate generall, and by this is that supposition also maimed, that in  
our



our case (where the Cardinal is said to haue affirmed, that what he did, he did *by speciall commandement*) hee was inferiour to a Legate, although in very trueth he sayth not so, but onely that he had a *speciall commandement* of his Holinesse, to doe what he cou'd, for the making vp the breach, which was suggested to the Pope, to haue been in England betweene the Seminarie priests, and Catholikes, as may be seene in the letters constitutive, prefixed to M. Collingtons booke. And yet to blind such as take pleasure therein, this author speaking of the Cardinall, demandeth, *who doth not know what a Cardinals testimonie in any Christian Catholike Court is worth: especially a Protector, testifying, and professing in his letters patents, to doe it ex speciali mandato Sanctissimi, as this man doth in his letters?* As this man doth not in his letters, more then wee now haue sayd: which was no commission, to make his *Subordination*. Let the letters bee sought, and it will soone be seene, that this fellow vsed these *Latine* words of his owne, and not out of the Cardinals letters: and that the like words are referred by the Cardinall to some other point, then the making of this *Subordination*. But to omit the iugling which is vsed betweene the Cardinals *doing it* sometime, as here fol. 108. and his *witnessing* sometime, *that his Holinesse did it*: as it was sayd in the Libel which D. Haddocke, and M. Martin Array put vp against M. Doctor Bishop, and M. Charnocke at Rome the tenth of January 1599, and all with the same letters, commonly called the *Constitutive letters*. This circumstance of being *Protector* doth litle helpe the matter: for that, as is sayd in *The hope of peace* pag. 33. this acte of the Card. was a subdelegation, as appeareth by those words of his letters, *Te deligimus &c. We make choice of you, whom for the time we subdelegate in that charge which was committed to vs*, and not an acte of *Protectorship*. And pag. 34. it is shewed that the office of a *Protector* stretcheth it selfe no further then the Court of Rome. For so doth Zecchius set it downe in his booke *De repub. Christiana: De statu Ill. Dom. Card. Nu. 9. In hoc Consistorio quæq; provincie, & regularium congregatio, ac reges habent suos patres tutelares, qui Protectores dicuntur: qui electiones, & alias causas provincie sibi commissæ, in Consistorio proponunt, & oppositoribus respondent. In this Consistorie eueery province, congregation of Regulars, and*



*kings haue their Fathers, who haue care of them: and these are called Protectors: these doe then propose elections, and other causes of the prouince, committed vnto them, and doe make answer to such, as oppose against them. This point is also handled by M. Collington pa. 66. and by M D Ely pa 163. & 164.*

*But not to stand vpon these matters (saith this poore man who in trueth can finde no footing in this his cause) it is a foule thing; what? for birds to defile their owne nests: as these vnited priests do oft in this Apologie, if they are authors thereof? you meane some other matter; Let vs heare it: when for couering our owne wils, of not obeying, we seeke holes in the coates, and authoritie of our Superiors. I wil shew you what is a foule thing; when for couering the lewdnesse of others, who shor at nothing els, then to haue you, and all the Secular cleargie of England vnder them as punies, and boyes, you will take vpon you to patronize and make their actions to be yours: that if through your folly, and their foule dealing they could preuaile, in their most vniust, and wicked attempt, you shall feele the smart of your blindnesse in which now you glory. And if they do not preuaile, you must beare the shame of your wicked enterprise But what holes are those, which these men are said to seeke in their superiors coats? and what superiors are they? Marke I pray, how this author dischargeth himselfe of this matter: as these men do both against the Cardinall Protector his auctoritie, and person, as also the Archpriest; yea and his Holines also in couert words, & so far as they dare. What, man? so farre, as they dare? what is that, which they would dare against his Holines? Forsooth perswading the people, that he hath beleueed false information: did any man euer dare to say: what? and perswade the people also, that the Pope could beleue false information? marry sir, here was such a hole found in h s coate, as himselfe could neuer haue scene. Here was Christs vicar himselfe very strangely abused: and thereby appointed a subordination most inconuenient. Were all those Popes fooles, whose letters are cited in the common Law, de rescriptis, & the Bishops also, to whō they did write in such forme, as they did acknowledge, they might be, and were often mil-informed, and did many things otherwise, then they would haue done, if they had bene truely informed? Si quando (saith Pope Alexander the third, to the*



the Archbishop of Rauenna. cap. *si quando de Rescriptis*) aliqua tua fraternitati dirigimus, quae animum tuum exasperare videntur, turbari non debes. Et infra. *Qualitatem negotij*, pro quo tibi scribitur, diligenter considerans, aut mandatum nostrum reuerenter adimpleas, aut per literas tuas, quare adimplere non possis, rationabilem causam pretendas, quia patienter sustinebimus, si non feceris, quod praenobis fuerit insinuatione suggestum. That is, If at any time we direct any things vnto your brotherhood, which seem to exasperate your minde, you ought not to be troubled thereat. And afterward, Having diligently considered of the quality of that busines, of which wee write vnto you, either fulfill our commandement reuerently, or pretend some reasonable cause, by your letters, why you cannot fulfill it. For we will patiently beare, that you do not that, which was by bad insinuation suggested vnto vs. Other Chapters there are there to be seene to this effect, which in this place would be needlessly cited; Onely this will suffice, to shew that it hath bene long since seene, that Popes could be falsly informed, and thereby also appoint a matter most inconuenient. And yet this was neuer taken for a hole in the Popes coat. But what more is there concerning this hole, not heard of in the Church before? The day would blinde Hugh saine haue seene, and those, that are deafe, would gladly heare, when it was euer heard of in the Church before, that an Archpriest was made Superior ouer all the Secular cleargie of two whole kingdomes, as now M. Blackwell is of England and Scotland. And that it is against all equitie and iustice, and that his Holines could not lawfully appoint it without their consents. The accepting of the auctoritie at the sight of his Holines Breue doeth conuince, that the priests neuer stood vpon his absolute authoritie, but vpon the custome, which by Law is also confirmed, that they should chuse their superior, which M. D. Bishop touched, and proued in his reply to F. Parsons pa. 151. and it is handled since more at large by M. D. Ely pag. 190. to 196. And that the meanes by which he had appointed, is insufficient, binding no man to obey it. If this man do meane, that the priests did not take the Cardinals letter, as sufficient to binde them to obey it, it is very true, that they thought those meanes insufficient, and they haue giuen diuers proofes of the insufficiencie thereof. If he meane any other matter, he must explicate himselfe.



selfe. For other meanes the priests did not know, vntil they saw  
 the *Breue* : at which time they did all submit themselues vnto  
 it : *All which must argue great insufficiencie, defect, and lacke of cō-*  
*sideration in his Holines proceeding.* They should haue had more  
 honestie, who gaue the false information : and their fault was  
 the greater, because so great a trust was reposed in them by his  
 Holines. And to mend these *holes* in the Popes *coat* I would  
 gladly vnderstand, why the two priests, who were first sent to  
 his Holines, were clapt vp close prisoners, before they could  
 haue accesse vnto him ? If his Holines could not *beleue wrong*  
*information*, then might the Iesuits, and the Sbirri with more  
 credit haue bene at their iayles, then seeking to imprison such  
 as came to *informe* his Holines. If his Holines could *beleue*  
*wrong informations*, and that these good men therefore ioyned  
 together to apprehend, and imprison the two priests : then is  
 this *hole* in his Holines *coate* patched vp againe : *that the Priests*  
*dared to perswade the people, that he hath beleued false informations:*  
 for this implieth that he could. And thus much for the *holes*  
 in his Holines *coat* : a pretie slubbering kinde of answere to the  
 priests reasons. The *Protectors* turne should be next, but this  
 author will owe him the patching vp of his *holes*, and will goe  
 helpe the Archpriest. *And as for the Archpriest their immediate*  
*superior* (saith he) *though in words they acknowledge his authority,*  
*&c. yet doe they seeke by all meanes possible, to discredit both him, his*  
*authority, and person.* The first matters seeme to concerne him,  
 and his person ; as that he is charged about his doubling in his  
 instructions, and about an heretical proposition. But how are  
 these things answered ? the first is thus awarded, *We cannot ap-*  
*prehend how it could be spoken* : the second thus. *If M. Blackwell*  
*should say, as wee are sure hee did not in the sense they take it* : two  
 poore shifts. But to the *Apologie* as it lieth. *And here in this place*  
*they will needs raise a certaine cauill against him* ( the Archpriest,  
 or his persō ) *saying that he doubled in his speech with M. Collingt.*  
*and M. Charnock* : for of their two relations onely all these matters  
 are raised against him ( vt in ore duorū, vel trium testiū (saith our  
 Sauour Matt. 8.) *itet omne verbum, that euery thing be tried by*  
*two or three witnesses* ) when at the first comming of the Cardinals  
 letters and instructions, he conferred them confidently with these two  
 (but



(but this his *confidence* wrought in him a marueilous confusion, when hee was taken tardy vpon too great a *confidence* of an vn-  
cleanly conueyance) *who so dutifully interpreted his speeches, as first they said he was contrary to himselfe, and affirmed his instructions to haue come from Rome together with his letters, which is most true, and they are to be seene vnder the Cardinals hand and seale, &c.* Marke how this matter is shuffled vp: He was neuer blamed for saying *his instructions came from Rome*, which were vnder the Cardinals hand and seale, but for saying that those instructions came from Rome which he shewed, and were neuer to be seene vnder the Cardinals hand and seale, but were of his owne making as he confessed, being enforced thereunto, when so much was conuincd by the contents, and that he had counterfeited them, which at that time was no little cōfusion vnto him. And thus may any reasonable man apprehend, how it could be spoken, which (this author sayth here) *wee cannot apprehend how it could be spoken.* We doe further *apprehend how it could be spoken*, and to what ende, that he had *authoritie. to excommunicate, and send priests to their answeere to the Court of Rome*, and how a nod could bee giuen toward the next chamber, to insinuate that there was his commission for this also: and yet neuer a worde true of all this which he spake. And the thing beeing *apprehended, how it could be*, and two priests ready to depose, that it was so, we doe further *apprehend*, that the Archpriest or his person deserued a greater punishment, then his factious adherents would should light vpon him, especially if his instructions, which he had so falsified, were sent by his Holines, and onely testified by the Card. as sometimes for an aduantage this fellow will vrge. But whither doe we wander, that this fellow vnderstood not, *how it could be spoken?* For the Archpriest himselfe could not well tell what hee said, as it should seeme by a letter of his of the second of *March* following, being charged with these matters: *Sir (sayth he) the Archpresbyter hath to doe about excommunications, and the sending to the Court of Rome.* But what? can he excommunicate, or hath he any power to send priests thither? no such matter. What is it then, that he can do? Marke I pray you his owne words, and how he answereth that which was laid to his charge: *For by his commission hee is charged to spe-*  
*cifie*



*cise all such rebellions and contumacies, as are too familiar with you, if they cannot be suppressed, with his authoritie at home, and to intimate the same to the Card. Protector his grace, and so by his meanes to procure excommunication, or the sending for to Rome, for the redresse of such licentiousnesse.* By this logicke then, a power to excommunicate, is a power to write to those who can procure it. And hee that cannot write to any, that can procure an excommunication, is not worthy to be said, to haue the power himselfe to excommunicate. But for the instructions, note I pray you how hee would shift the matter: *And for the particular instructions, he neuer said they were all made at Rome.* Indeepe there was no cause, why he should vse those particular words, neither is the charge so to be vnderstood. Hee is thus charged by Master Collington and M. Charnocke, that after the Cardinals letter was read, he put them in mind, that the letter did mention certaine instructions, which should be annexed thereunto: and therewithall drew a paper out of his bosome, which he did not deliuer vnto them to read (as he had done the letter) but kept it still in his owne hands, affirming that those were the instructions which were meant in the letter, and he read them as such: and being taken in the maner, and conuincd, that they could not be such, he confessed that some of them were of his owne making. And this will the two priests aboue named iustifie before God and the world, where this poore shift will not serue: *he neuer said they were all made at Rome, nor this new deuise: But that his instructions made at Rome, gaue him authoritie to set downe Rules, about all particular matters and cases of such qualitie.*

*Moreover (saith he) they gaue out amongst their friends, that he had spoken an hereticall proposition: whereupon M. Bishop tolde the same in Rome, as appeareth in his examination, affirming to haue heard it of his fellow M. Charnocke, who yet as farre as we vnderstand, did set downe nothing thereabout in his depositions.* Perchance Fa. Parsons was loath to trouble M. Charnocke with any such interrogation: for doubtlesse, if he had bene asked this question, his answer would haue bene here also inserted, especially if he had denied it. The auoiding then of such a question to M. Charnocke must needs be suspicious, his examination both being begun before M. Bishops, as appeareth in the 9. chapter of this

*Apologie*



*Apologie fol. 129. and ended some 9. or 10. dayes, after M. Bishops examination, as appeareth in the same chapter fol. 134. And in this latter English Libell, againe diuers times mention is made thereof by a certaine censurer intituled, M. I. B. comenting vpon a letter of Fa. Parsons, but nothing affirming or denying, but onely entertayning the speech, that an hereticall proposition had bene obiected, or spoken of at Rome against the Archpriest, There was no place for to handle any proposition in that censure, more then the letter of Fa Parsons gaue cause, And he gaue no other cause then in these generall termes: you tooke the way first to discredite so much as in you lay, M. Blackwell, &c. yea in the very matter of his faith: for that an hereticall proposition was layd to his charge \* pag. 62. The censurer perchance did not know thus much but vpon Fa. Parsons word: to which he gaue little credit, and therefore vsed those words, pag. 88. if it should be true which Fa. Parsons saith in the 17 paragrasse, that M Blackwell was touched in the very matter of his faith, and offereth to prooue it by certaine depositions, yet extant at Rome, that an hereticall proposition was layde to his charge. I doubt their ground for going to Rome will hardly be shaken. And this is the oftener inculcated, because Fa. Parsons in the same letters where he mentioneth this deposition, doth often affirme, that there was nothing of substance brought against the Archpriest pag 55. And a little after that their enterprise of contradiction was without foundation at all. pag. 59. And againe, that his Holinesse and the Cardinals were ashamed, to finde them to haue come so long a iourney with so little to say, pag. 58. And the censurer thought, that he had discharged himselfe sufficiently in that action, when he shewed how vnadvisedly F. Parsons still ranne vpon this point, that the two priests had nothing to say worth the handling, and yet confesseth that they had to touch, yea and touched M. Blackwell in the very matter of his faith, pag. 62. But now this author will set it downe more particularly, and answere for Blackwell.*

*And the proposition forsooth was, that M. Blackwel should say vnto them, that they could not appeale from him to the Pope himselfe: well good sir, how doe you answere for M. Blackwell? which if M. Blackwell should say, as we are sure he did not in the sense they take it. In what sense doe they take it which the plaine wordes*



doe not giue? what a poore shift is this to say, *if he should say it, as we are sure he did not, in that sense they take it?* Then you are not sure, that *he did not say it*, but that he did not say it, *in the sense they take it*. If you should complain that you were stricken, would you take it for an argument, that you were not stricken, because the striker did not strike you, *in that sense that you take it?* He spake it, and stood peremptorily in it, after that he was often admonished of the danger thereof, by M. Collington, and M. Charnocke: and this flying to *senses*, which are so secret, as they may not be knowen, nor can be imagined to bee other, then the words doe giue, bewrayeth too much guiltinesse. But marke, I pray you another shift, at a dead lift. *If M. Blackwell should say it, &c. yet many men in the world may say this in diuerse causes, wherein appeale is cut off by his Holinesse consent, and order.* Doth the power which is in other men in the world, giue M. Blackwell a warrant, to say this or that, because they can say it? If many men in the world may say, that appeale is not to be made from them to the Pope himselte, many men in the world may say more then becommeth them, but in such cases, as *wherein appeale is cut off by his Holinesse consent and order.* Which *consent and order* they are to shew, or to be taken for such, as M. Blackwell was taken; that is, either very ignorant, or a worse thing. Such Commissions are commonly granted with this clause *appellatione remota*, or some other equiualent, which can not be found in the Cardinals letters, or his instructions, which were all the commission which he had, when he stoode vpon this point: nor to this day is *appellation* from him *to the sea of Rome* cut off by any consent or order of his Holinesse, although the Breue of the 17. of August 1601. doth not admit of the Appeale, his Holinesse being perswaded, that it could not be followed without further trouble. And if he had this clause from his Holinesse himselte in any commission *Appellatione remota*, yet would no man of vnderstanding affirme, that the Priestes could not appeale from him to the Pope himselte, according to that chapter. *Pastoralis de officio & potestate iudicis delegati. Si Papa scienter commisit appellationem interpositam à suo delegato dato cum clausula appellatione remota, iurisdictio primi delegati est interim suspensa, quoad executionem, &c.* If the Pope hath wittingly committed



committed an appellation, which was made from his delegate, who was delegated with this clause *appellatione remota*, (without admitting any appeale) the iurisdiction of that first delegate is the meane while suspended from any execution: *Donec* (saith Pope Innocent the third, out of whose words the Rubricke is made) *appellationis merita plenius sint discussa*: untill the causes of the appellation be discussed. And *Launcelot lib. 3. tit. de Appell. Interdum non obstante prohibitione appellari poterit*. Sometime it is lawfull to appeale notwithstanding the prohibition. And he putteth some cases for example. *Licet causa (appellatione remota) commissa fuerit*: although the cause were committed with this clause, *appellatione remota*, without admitting any appeale: so that whatsoever this authour of the *Apologie* sayth, few men will say so much, as M. Blackwell said: Although appellation from them be sometimes cut off with his Holinesse consent, and order: and much lesse where there was no such cutting off, as may be seene in his letters by which he was instituted Archpriest. Besides that, these were not his Holinesse letters, but the Cardinall Caietans: and therefore as yet was there lesse cause to stand so peremptorily vpon this point, as M. Blackwell did, after that he was tolde of his errour. And if M. Charnocke in conscience had thought this to haue bene heresie, or hereticall, he was bound vnder paine of excommunicatio (especially being in Rome) to haue prosecuted the matter, &c. M. Charnocke might haue thought that it was heresie or hereticall, and might haue had the purpose to prosecute it in Rome: who can say the contrary? But then why did he not? perchance because it ranne in his mind, as good neuer a whit, as neuer the better. Perchance he might dreame that M. Blackwell had some secret sense, contrary to the purport of the wordes, and say, that he meant all well. What if it were set downe in writing among those notes, which the Popes officer tooke from him, as Fa. Parsons insinuated in his letter to M D. Bishop, which is in *The copies of discourses*, in these words, pag. 62. *Moreouer it appeareth by your papers and depositions yet extant, that you tooke the way first to discredit (so much as in you lay) M. Blackwell &c. yea in the very matter of his faith*. And if M. Bishop did depose, that he heard such a matter of M. Charnocke, how farre were the examiners bound, especially at Rome, to prosecute this matter, it being



being there deposed in that manner? Or where should *M. Charnocke* haue prosecuted it, being close prisoner, and committed to his aduersaries to be kept, examined, and haue all his words and actions interpreted by them, and was debarred of conference with any but them; whereby hee might well perceiue there was no fit place for him to deale in any matter, but what the Iesuites would like of, and their adherents: in so much as if *Fa. Parsons* haue any truth in him, the Pope was hardly brought to thinke, that *M. Bishop* & he were Catholike priests? And was this (trow you) a conuenient place, or time for him to enter into any course (had he bene otherwise bound thereto) against another, especially such a man, as whose discredite would be so great a blowe vnto *M. Charnockes* laylor, as hee could not haue had the like in the Court of Rome? But how hangeth that together which followeth; *and not hauing done so* (that is, prosecuted this matter at Rome) *and yet procuring in these late libels to renue the speech thereof againe.* How is this proued? *It is easely seene, that their intention:* now he is fallen from *M. Charnockes* supposed acte, to *their intention:* as though, if it had bene true, that *M. Charnocke* had procured to renue those speeches, and that all those friends had forgotten it, amongst whom in this place the *Apologie* confesseth it was giuen out, the intention of the rest could be discouered to be *onely to discredite the person of their superiour in what they may, which* (saith he) *is a bad kind of obedience.* He may sweare it, for it was neuer heard that the acte of discrediting of a man, was an act of obedience, vnlesse the *Superiour* would giue such a foolish cōmandement against himselfe, which *M. Blackwell* will neuer do, as we hope. And although that these bookes were printed, as here it is vr-  
ged, after that *M. Blackwell* was made a lawfull *Superiour*, (to wit by his Holinesse *Breue*) yet these matters were touched (as long past before the *Breue* came, and at such time, as hee was deemed to be intruded, without his Holinesse knowledge) to shew what iust causes the Priests had, to be aduised before they should resolue, to subiect themselues vnto him.

After this long paine, to finde *holes in Superiors coates*, the author is fallen againe into the priests reasons, among which hee citeth those, which wee haue now once already answered, to  
wit,



wit, that his Holinesse could not do it lawfully without their consents, and that the election pertained unto them, and the like. One newe deuise he hath for some varietie, as for that it is a forreine authoritie and subiect to danger of Premunire, which is answered before, that the priests did not plead this, or giue it as a reason against the authority, but alleaged it as the opinion onely of diuers men of iudgement in the lawes of our countrey, as may be seene in the sixt page of the English booke, and prooued thereby, that in wisdom they might pause vpon their submitting themselves vnto the authority, seeing no other warrant for it, then a Cardinals letter, to whom they knew no tye of obedience, much lesse in a matter of so great moment. And that this was all which they did, it is euident in that so soone, as they did see his Holinesse letter (whom they knew to be their Superior) they all yeelded themselves. And as it is sayd before, if our princes of the same religion, of which we were, did punish such as accepted of any dignities by prouision from Rome, without their cōsents, the priests might assuredly expect some seueritie of a prince of a contrary religion. And as they were not bound to accept thereof, before it was confirmed by his Holinesse, so did they thinke it great follie to exasperate the state any more against them, by accepting of so strange and needles a noueltie.

*And these reasons (saith the Apologie) are set downe and printed in two of the first treatises of this English booke intituled, Copies of discourses, which were written before the Breue came foorth for confirmation of the Archpriest: and therefore they ought to haue bene answered according to that time, not with this idle shift: His Holines Institution. For as then it was not knowne, that it was his Holinesse Institution, as here is confessed in these words, Before the Breue came foorth. And consequently it seemeth strange to vs, why they were now permitted after the Breue is foorth, and hath not wrought that effect for quieting them, which then they promised* What then will this fellow say to all the testimonies brought by himselfe, to proue the peace was made at the sight of the Breue Cap. 10. *Apol?* what will he answer to his Holinesse Breue of the seuenteenth of August 1601, where his Holinesse auoucheth it that all was presently ended vpon the sight



of his *Breue* of the sixt of *Aprill 1599*. His riddle then is thus read: that the *Breue* did worke that effect in the priests, which they promised, as we haue now shewed. But not long after the Iesuits began to spread abroad, and that the priests, who obeyed not, before they saw the *Breue*, were *schismaticks*: and the Archpriest was so farre from controlling this reuiued faction of the Iesuits, as hee published a *resolution* pretended to come from Rome, that the refusers of his authoritie were *schismatikes*. And now it will not seeme strange to a reasonable man, that these *discourses* were now printed, for that now there was need to perswade Catholickes, that the priests were not then *schismatikes*: which perswasion the priests thought it fit to further, by declaring the true state of matters, how they then stood, and vpon what reasons. And these were best, and most sincerely to be shewed by the letters, which passed at that time to and fro, and by laying downe the causes, which then they had, and might haue, to deferre their obedience, vntill they saw the *Breue*: and thereby giue satisfaction to Catholickes, that they had not been *schismatikes*, as the Iesuites and Archpriest began now againe after the peace made, to publish against them.

But now after these treatises (sayth this author) ensueth an *Epistle* of M. Anthony Champneys, which we would hardly beleue to bee his, if he had not suffered his name to be put downe in print to the same. For we had greater opinion both of his discretion, learning, and modestie, then that hee would vtter such things as in this epistle are contained: especially matter of so much gall against the Fathers of the societie, vnder whom he hath bene brought vp, and of whose order for diuers yeeres (as we are informed) hee sought to bee. Note this author his opinion of M. Champneys discretion, learning and modestie, and how that this opinion must no longer last, because he maintaineth his good name against the slanderous tongues of the Iesuites, and their associates, in their vniust accusation of *Schisme*, and *disobedience*. And whosoever shall reade his *Epistle*, which is heere mentioned, shall perceiue great cause, why that good and reuerent opinion was rather to be still kept by that *Epistle*, then the least iot diminished, as hauing shewed very discretely, learnedly, and modestly, how wrongfully he, and other graue and reuerend Catholicke priests were charged



charged by the Iesuites and their adherents. But this seemeth very strange to many, that there being so reuerend an opinion of his *discretion, learning, and modestie*, as this author affirmeth, they would not admit him into their order, hauing sought it for *diuers yeeres*, as here is affirmed. Will hee perchance haue his reader to vnderstand, that a man of *discretion, learning, and modestie*, cannot well suite with that religious order? or that such men are not thought fit for such purposes, as the *master of misrule* would effect in our countrey, who now hath the disposing of our English Iesuites, and is of opinion perchance, that the further off a man is from *discretion, learning, and modestie*, the fitter will he be to further his designs, and hath for the instruction of his nouices, or encouragement to other, written this *Apologie*, and shewed that he himselfe hath neither *discretion, learning, nor modestie*, or else that his instruments must haue defect at the least in some one or two of these three vertues, as the author of the Treatise of *Schisme*, and his abettors therein, who were thought to haue had some *learning*, but they haue giuen an earnest penny in that Treatise, that they neither had *discretion, modestie, nor learning*? And M. *Champney* might be thought to be highly fauoured of God, that he escaped so great a danger, seeking it himselfe for *diuers yeeres* (as here is said) although no doubt he might haue bene of the societie, and haue taken such good and religious courses, as we doubt not but that many of that order doe. But those commonly (sayth this author) are worse when they loose their spirit, seeking to pacifie the remorse of their owne conscience, by deuising defects against them whome they left. See how this fellow doubleth in his tale. If M. *Champney* sought for *diuers yeeres* to be of the societie, why was he not admitted, they hauing an opinion of him to be of *discretion, learning, and modestie*? could he doe any more then to seeke it, and to perseuere in seeking it for *diuers yeeres*, as here is confessed? how is hee charged to haue left them? Is it not rather euident that they would not admit him? Againe, I would faine knowe what remorse of conscience it is, which a man of *discretion, learning, and modestie*, can haue, for missing that, for the effecting of which he did the vttermost, which hee could morally doe. He sought it, you say, for *diuers yeeres*: and is hee to be charged with



with any thing, of which he should haue *remorse of conscience*: he should perchance haue continued still that mind to be a Iesuite, but must haue deserued it by some employment vnder you; in which if hee had not had that plausible successe which you desired; the Secular priests must haue borne the shame thereof, because whatsoeuer he was in desire, or in the aduventure, yet in his state he had been no other then a Secular priest. *And so by this Epistle he payeth all his former obligations vnto them, by as hatefull speeches as commonly any enemy could utter.* This author hath shewed you the obligations which M. Champney had vnto them, which perchance were obligations in them toward him, in that he perseuered *diuers yecres*, seeking to be of them, and was likely to haue beene a greater credit vnto them, then any of our nation, which haue bene employed here in our English affaires, being accounted a man of *discretion, learning, and modestie*. And can any man thinke, that if there were any *hatefull speeches* in his *Epistle* against the Societie, that this author would not mention them? *But leauing this* (sayth he) *we come to the point it selfe, wherein hee sheweth as little sound iudgement of learning, as any other that had his hand in the booke.* Prouided alwayes, that it be remembred, how that this author dealeth against a man, who otherwise hath bene esteemed *discreete, learned, and modest*, which qualities were neuer known to haue had greater aduersaries then *indiscretion, ignorance, and immodestie*. And here these shew themselves now against M. Champney his *learning, discretion, and modestie*. For first (sayth this author) *hee will needs take vpon him in this Epistle to prooue, that he and his fellowes had great reason in doing as they did, and that it neither was nor is any sinne or disobedience at all: for* (sayth he) *to disobey, is to resist, contemne, and impugne the known commandement of a Superiour.* His reasons (good Sir) you are contented to let them rest for this time: and you imploy your talent against this definition of *disobedience*, in which you haue offended against *modestie*, as we take it, in that you would so bold'y relate his words with falshood. Is it all one with you, *It is midday, or midnight*; and, *it is midday, and midnight*? His words are, *resist, contemne, or impugne*: and you cite them, *resist, contemne, and impugne*. And in the margent you make this note, *The large definition of disobedience,*



*bedience, deuised for excuse of the troublesome.* Know you what you say? If this be the large definition of *disobedience*, how doe you here exclude out of it the *disobedience* of *Adam*, *Saul*, and *Achan*, whome you confesse to haue disobeyed, and sinned by their *disobedience*? yea you deduce the matter in such sort, as you prooue this definition to be onely of that *disobedience*, which is the sinne against the holy Ghost. For thus you argue speaking of *Samuel*: *He did not say to Saul, why diddest thou resist, contemne, or impugne, which is not onely disobedience, but rebellion and obstination, of which obstination S. Thomas in the question by M. Champney cited, affirmeth to be the sinne against the holy Ghost?* And yet in the margent, you will make a note, That this is a large definition of *disobedience*, deuised for the excuse of the troublesome. For which hee (M. Champney) citeth S. Thomas (sayth this author) 2.2 quæst. 104. art. 1. & quæst. 105 per totum. But here we would aske M. Champney, that came so late from his studie, whether to euery sinfull *disobedience*, yea mortall sinne, it be needfull that the *disobedient* should resist, contemne, and impugne, or whether S. Thomas in these places by him alledged, doth define any such thing, and not the plaine contrary? In the absence of Master Champney, who perchance at his returne will giue some larger satisfaction, it is for this time answered: First, that here is a iugling of mortall sinne, and *disobedience*, as if M. Champney did vndertake to define euery mortall sinne, and not the sinne of *disobedience*. Secondly, it is answered directly to the question: first, concerning euery mortall sinne, that to euery mortall sinne it is needfull that the *disobedient* should resist, contemne, or impugne, according to the doctrine of S. Thomas here cited, quæst. 104. art. 3. in corpore. These are his words: *Sicut peccatum consistit in hoc, quod homo, contempto Deo, commutabilibus bonis inhæret: As sinne consisteth in this, that man (God being contemned) doth follow such a good as is subiect to change.* And now concerning *disobedience*, it is also answered, that the *disobedient*, not as an adulterer or a thiefe, but as *disobedient* doth resist, contemne, or impugne, not onely virtually (as euery sinner doth, according to S. Thomas cited immediatly before, and which were enough to iustifie M. Champneys wordes in euery mortall *disobedience*) but actually. And in this sence doth Nauar. in his Manuel. cap. 23.



nu. 35. define disobedience. *Inobedientia* (sayth hee) prout est speciale vitium, est vitium inclinans ad non faciendum, quod iubetur, eo principaliter, quod iubetur: Disobedience as it is a speciall vice, (that is, as disobedience) is a vice inclining not to doe that which is commanded, principally because it is commanded. And for this he citeth S. Thomas 2. 2. quest. 104. and then hee addeth this: *Ita quod ex duobus conficitur inobedientia specialis, scilicet ex non faciendo iussu, & ex animo non faciendi illud, eo principaliter quod iubetur*: So that disobedience (as disobedience) consisteth of two things, to wit, of not doing that which is commanded; and of a minde not to doe it, principally because it is commaunded. S. Thomas quest. 104. ar. 2. ad primum, sayth directly of disobedience (as it is a speciall vice, that is, as disobedience.) *Ad inobedientiam requiritur, quod actualiter contemnat praeceptum*: In disobedience it is to be required, that the commandement be actually contemned. And quest. 105. ar. 1. ad primum: *Nec etiam omne peccatum mortale est, inobedientia proprie, & per se loquendo, sed solum tunc, quando aliquis praeceptum contemnit, quia ex fine morales actus speciem habent*: Cum autem facit aliquid contra praeceptum, non propter praecepti contemptum, sed propter aliquid aliud est inobedientia materialiter tantum. sed pertinet formaliter ad aliam speciem peccati. That is, Neither is euery mortall sinne a disobedience, if we speake properly, but only then when the commandement is contemned, because morall actions take their nature of their end: But when a man doth anything against a commaundement, not vpon contempt of the commaundement, but vpon some other motiue, it is onely materially a disobedience, but formally it appertaineth to another kind of sinne: and is called for example, pride, couetousnes, theft, or such like not disobedience. By this it appeareth, that M. Champney is vniustly blamed: & that the author of the Apologie may as yet goe to M. Champney his lecture: and in the meane while if he would be silent, he might be taken for a iolly fellow. But who is so bolde as blinde bayard? And thus he runneth on. For if it be true that no man doeth sinne by disobedience, but he onely who doeth resist, contemne, and impugne, (M. Champneys words are, or impugne) his superiors cōmandement, how was Adams offence so greatly punished in him, & his posterity? wherein yet we doe not reade, that he did resist, contemne, or impugne the Commandement of God Almighty about the apple: but onely did simply



ply disobey by eating the same which was forbidden. We might here make answere out of S. Thomas, that there was a contempt: for so hee saith, *Quest. 104. ar. 3. in corp. peccatum consistit in hoc quod homo contempto Deo &c. Sinne consisteth in this, that man (God condemned) doth follow such a good as is subiect to change.* And if reply be made, that it is no *actuell contempt*; I will aske where they read this word *actuell* in M. Champneys definition of *disobedience*? But to make this matter more cleare, I demaund of this author whether that this sinne of Adam were a sinne of *disobedience* formally; that is, the same which is called *peccatum inobedientiae* or no? If he answer affirmatiuely, then he must confesse, according to the doctrine of S. Thomas *quest. 104 ar. 2. ad. 1.* that there was an *actuell contempt*. If he answer negatiuely, and that it was some other sinne, as S. Thomas affirmeth *quest. 150. ar. 2. ad 3.* that it was *pride* and not *disobedience*, otherwise then euery sinne may in a generall terme be called *disobedience*, then is not this example to the purpose. For M. Champney did not define *pride*, but *disobedience*, and not *disobedience* in the largest manner as here it is foolishly noted in the margent (which as S. Thomas saith *quest. 104. ar. 2. ad. primum*, is a generall sinne, as *obedience* may be a generall vertue if *obedience* be taken for an execution of any thing, which may be commanded, and *disobedience* for an omitting to do the same, vpon whatsoeuer intention) but *disobedience* (as *disobedience*,) to which S. Thomas saith in the same place is necessarily required, that the commandement be *actually contemned*. The same answere is to be made to the next instance, which this author giueth against M. Champney his definition of *disobedience*. Neither do we read (saith he) that Achan in the spoile of Iericho did resist, contemne, or impugne the commandement of Ioshua, that nothing should be touched, or saued of the goods of that towne, but being delighted with some part thereof, held it to himselfe. See how this fellow minseth the matter, being delighted with some part thereof, held it to himselfe. Whereas the words of Achan Ios. the 7. are these, *concupiscens abstuli, couerting them I tooke them away*. By which it is euident, that his sinne was *couetousnes*, and not *disobedience*, but in that large maner, in which the *pride* of Adam, and euery mortal sinne according to S. Thomas might be called *disobedience*. And if this author will  
Cc 2 auouch,



auouch, that it was *formall disobedience*, that is, the speciall vice of *disobedience*, then do we say according to *S. Thomas* before cited, that there was an *actuell contempt*. The third instance is of King *Saul* for his sparing the *Amalekites*, and retaining some part of their goods: for the which (saith this author) *Samuel* said vnto him, *Quare non audisti vocem Domini? why diddest thou not heare, or obey the Commandement of God uttered to me? He did not say, Why diddest thou resist, contemne, or impugne? which is not onely disobedience, but rebellion, and obstination; of which obstination S. Thomas (in the question by M. Champney cited) affirmeth to be sinne against the holy Ghost: Non omnis, &c.* I first demand of this author, what hee thinketh of this sinne of *Saul*, what kinde of sinne, or what name it had in speciall? *S. Thomas* aboue cited saith, that the name of *Adams* sinne was *pride*, and *Acan* confessed that his sinne was *couetousnes*. Now are we to finde out the name of *Sauls* sinne. If credit may be giuen to *Lyra* at the very beginning of his Comment vpon the 15. Chap. of the first booke of the Kings, whence this story is taken, the transgression of *Saul* was, *Ex cupiditate, & superbia, vpo couetousnes, and pride*, so that then this must be the name of his sinne, and then is the same answer made to this instance, which was made to the other. And if this author will contend, that his sinne was neither *pride*, nor *couetousnesse*, he must tell vs, what he will haue it called. And if he will haue it to haue no other name, but *disobedience*, and that it was that speciall sinne, which is called *disobedience*: then doe I say according to *S. Thomas*, quest. 104. ar. 2. ad. primum, that there was an *actuell contempt*. But the Prophet did not say, *Why didst thou resist, contemne, or impugne?* How then good Sir, I perceiue the spirit is not cleane gone from you as yet, in which you offered to take your oath, to a Gentleman in the Temple a little before your going ouer, that you neither then were, nor euer meant to be a *Papist*. You cannot be ignorant what sort of people do ground their arguments against the *Catholikes*, vpon such negatiue propositions. The Prophet (say you) did not say, *why didst thou resist, contemne, or impugne?* But if it also be found, that the Prophet did say thus much, where then will ye say your spectacles were, if you did reade out the Chapter? or if you did not reade it



it out, what blind bayard would haue bene so bold as to affirme peremptorily that the Prophet did not say so? I reade in the 23 verse, *Pro eo quod abiicisti sermonem Domini &c.* Because thou hast contemptuously cast away the commandement of God: & verse 26. *Et ait Samuel ad Saul, non reuertar tecum: Anã Samuel said vnto Saul, I will not returne with thee.* Why so? *Quia proiecisti sermonem Domini:* or *Quia spreuisti verbum Domini,* (as *Lyra* saith according to another editiõ) because thou diddest despise the commandement of God. You could content your selfe with those words, *Quare non audisti? Why didst thou not heare?* and dissemble those which followed in the same chapter, which doe imply a contempt. But yet make your answer, whether you will haue this act of *Saul*, a formall acte of *disobedience*, and then you are told, that according to the doctrine of *S. Thomas*, here must be an *actuell contempt*, or some other mortall sinne. And then, although according to the doctrine also of *S. Thomas*, it includeth at the least a vertual contempt: which if you confesse, you cannot impugne *M. Champney* his definition, yet is not your instance ought worth against the definition of *disobedience* as it is a speciall sin, which and no other sin was defined by *M. Champney*. But marke I pray you another point of this authors diuinity: He (*Samuel*) did not say, *why didst thou resist, contemne, or impugne, which is not only disobedience, but rebellion, and obstination, of which obstination S. Thomas in the question by M. Champney cited, affirmeth to be sinne against the holy Ghost: Non omnis inobedientia* (saith he) *est peccatũ in Spiritum sanctum, sed solum illa cui obstinatio adhibetur: Not euery disobedience is sinne against the holy Ghost, but that onely whereto is adioyned obstination.* Is euery sinne of disobedience, (I say not of theft, nor murder nor such like, but of disobedience formally taken, as here *M. Champney* doth define it) a sin against the holy Ghost? This is a very strange doctrine, that a man that obeyeth not, because he will not obey, shall be sayd to sinne against the holy Ghost: yet doth this followe of this doctrine in the *Apologie*: for (sayth hee) *to resist, or to contemne, or to impugne, is rebellion and obstination, of which S. Thomas sayth is a sinne against the holy Ghost: but as S. Thomas affirmeth quest. 104. art. 2. ad primum. Ad inobedientiam &c.* It is required to disobedience, as disobedience, that there bee an *actuell contempt*, therefore euery disobedience, as disobedience, is a sinne against



the holy Ghost. A very faire piece of diuinitie ; yet well fitting the diuine author of this *Apologie*, who, had he had the least honesty, although he had no diuinitie, he would not haue vsed S. *Thomas* in this sort : For in the very place where he had his diuinity, of the sinne against the holy Ghost, S. *Thomas* teacheth him (if he had had the wit, or the grace to haue learned) that *not the contempt of euery hinderance of sinne, doeth make a sinne against the holy Ghost* (by which also he explicateth what he meaneth by obstination) *for then the contempt of euery thing that good is, should be a sinne against the holy Ghost, because by euery good thing a man may be hindered from sinne. Sed bonorum illorum contemptus facit peccatum in Spiritum sanctum, quæ directe ducunt ad pœnitentiam, & remissionem peccatorum : But the contempt of that good doth make a sinne against the holy Ghost, which good doth directly leade to penance, or repentance, and remission of sinnes* : So that the general doctrine here set downe in the *Apologie*, that a contempt is a sinne against the holy Ghost, and fathered vpon S. *Thomas*, is shewed out of S. *Thomas* to bee very false doctrine, and onely that contempt is to bee accounted a sinne against the holy Ghost, which is a contempt of such goodnesse, or good things, as directly doe bring a man to penance, or repentance, and remission of his sinnes. These good prefaces being made by the author of the *Apologie*, hee would seeme to draw to some point : in which if you marke him, you shall finde his error : Wherefore (saith he) according to S. *Thomas* doctrine, declared also by other schoolemen, and most briefly and cleerely by Caie-tane in his Summe, a man may commit damnable sinne by disobedience two wayes. First, formally and properly, when hee resoluth not to obey, which includeth contempt. And of this meaneth S. *Thomas*, when he sayth : *Ad inobedientiam requiritur, quod actualiter contemnat quis speciale preceptum. It is required to inobedience formally taken ; that a man doe contemne actually the particular precept of his Superiour. quest. 105. ar. 2. ad prim.* Now then there wanteth nothing but for this Author to shew, that when M. Champney did define disobedience, he did not define disobedience, as disobedience, and as it is formally taken, but for example theft, murder, or some such other sinne. His plaine words are of disobedience precisely, and nothing els, and all his discourse is to proue that



that there was no *disobedience*. And will any man doubt, but that he defined *disobedience* as *disobedience*? Hath not this author brought himselfe into a good case, that after all this girding at M. Champney for saying that *disobedience* (he sayd not *theft* nor *murder*, but *disobedience*) did include a *contempt*, and now this author confesseth so much, and can briug S. Thomas to prooue it, (although he mistake the question; for it is in the 104. quest.) whom M. Champney cited, and this author affirmed before very boldly, that S. Thomas *did not onely not define any such thing*, as M. Champney cited, but the plaine contrary?

But let vs see how this author proceedeth in his discourse against the definition giuen of *disobedience*; wherefore (saith he) according to S. Thomas doctrine (but you must go looke where) declared also by other Schoolemen; and most briefly and clearly by Caietane in his Summe, (in the margent is this note, Caietane in summa, verbo Obedientia,) A man may commit damnable sinne by disobedience two wayes, First formally, and properly, &c. And so he goeth forward & proueth no more then M. Champney affirmed, to wit, that there is an *actuell contempt* in *disobedience*, as *disobedience* is of it selfe a sinne. But when he commeth to the other way of sinning by *disobedience*, (which is some two leaues after) he changeth his termes, and telleth his tale of a *materiall disobedience*, and flieth off from the sinning by *disobedience*, which he should haue followed: for so are his words. A man may commit damnable sinne by disobedience two wayes, First formally, and properly. This is one way: the other then belike must be *materially and improperly*, which member is of his owne deuise. And neither S. Thomas his doctrine, nor Caietans in the place which he would cite, (for his note booke, as it should seeme deceiued him, not onely in coating the question wrong, and the sentence also out of S. Thomas, which here he citeth, but Caietane also) who verb. *Inobedientia*, (and not *Obedientia*, as he citeth him) saith, *Inobedientia dupliciter incurritur, vel per se, hoc est ex intentione, i. Disobedience is two wayes incurred. First, as it is a disobedience: that is, when there is an intention not to obey*, and this he calleth afterward, a formall disobedience. *Incurritur autem inobedientia materialiter, quandocumq; non ex intentione inobediendi, sed alia intentione, contra precepta Dei, vel Superiorum homo facit. A material*



*rial disobedience (or disobedience materially taken) is incurred, whensoever a man doeth against the Commandements of God, or his Superiours, not with intention of disobeying, but upō some other intention: & tunc inobedientia non est speciale peccatum, sed concurrit generaliter cum omni peccato, in quantum in eo est inobedientia Dei &c. And then disobedience is not a speciall sinne, but concurreth generally with every sinne, forasmuch as disobedience to God is in that sinne. So that according to Caietane, a man doeth not commit damnable sin two wayes by disobedience, but one way onely, that is, when he doeth sinne with intention not to obey. And when he sinneth against some Commandement of God, he sinneth by some other sin, and not by disobedience, although in the committing of that sinne, he is disobedient to God. As for example: A thiefe is disobedient to God, but this sinne is by stealing, and not by disobedience, vnlesse he make it a formall acte of disobedience: for then he sinneth two wayes: one way by stealing, another way by disobedience. As if a thiefe steale, because he will disobey this commandement, thou shalt not steale, he sinneth both by theft, and by disobedience, and more by disobedience, then by theft. But if a thiefe steale, because hee will steale, then although he commit a disobedience, he sinneth by stealing, and not by disobedience, and his act is not to be called an acte of disobedience, but an acte of theft, quia ex fine morales actus speciem habent, saith S. Tho. quest. 105. ar. 1. ad. 1. because moral actions take their nature of their end, for which they are done. And M. Champney did well define disobedience when he said, It was to resist, contemne, or impugne the known commandement of a Superiour, and he defined it according to S. Thomas doctrine, who quest. 104. ar. 2. ad. 1. affirmeth that, ad inobedientiam requiritur, quod actualiter contemnat preceptum: To disobedience it is required, that a man doe actually contemne the precept. But yet marke (saith the author of the Apologie, after that he hath cited a place out of S Thomas, which as I thinke should be this, which I haue cited, and hee hath mistaken the question, and the sentence) how Caietane doth explicate these words, (and in the margent he referreth his Reader to Caietanes Summe, as before) Idem est, (saith he) contemptus precepti, & nolle ex intentione obedire precepto: It is the selfe same thing to contemne the precept of our Superiour,*



riour, as to haue intention not to obey his commandement. First it is euident that *Caietane* doth not take any sentence out of *S. Tho.* to explicate, but explicateth himselfe according to the opinion which *S. Tho.* held of *disobedience*. Secondly there is very deceitfull dealing in the translation of *Caietans* wordes, where *nolle ex intentione obedire*, are construed to haue intention not to obey, whereas the words imply a formall resistance, or repugnance to obey. And thus by degrees he would conclude somewhat against that which is said of *disobedience*, as *disobedience*. For in this manner he proceedeth. By which we see, that neither in this proper, and formall kind of *disobedience*, is it needfull, that a man doe openly resist, contemne, or impugne. But it is sufficient that by one way or other, hee hath an intention not to doe that which is commanded; So that *M. Champney* teacheth vs very absurdly, that no man disobeyeth sinfully, except he resist, contemne, and impugne. See to what he hath brought this matter. *Disobedience*, which hath hitherto according to *S. Thom.* bene taken for a sinne, which doth containe an actuall contempt of precept, now requireth no such matter. But it is sufficient for *disobedience* properly and formally taken, that by one way or other, the offender haue an intention, not to doe that which is commanded; and consequently according to this doctrine of the *Apologie*, e-very mortall sinne almost which a man committeth, must bee two double sinnes, one in the kind, in which it is, as *theft* in stealing, *murther* in killing, and so forth: and it must be *disobedience* also formally taken: that is, as it is a speciall vice, in that by one way or other, he must needes haue an intention, not to doe that which is commanded, to wit, to refraine from stealing and killing For this, saith the author of the *Apologie*, is sufficient to make a proper and formall *disobedience*, whether it be done in secret, or openly, which word I knowe not how he hath thrust it in, or to what purpose, the doing a thing openly or not openly, being nothing to the nature of the sinne, but to the scandall which may grow vpon an openly committed sinne. So that not *M. Champney* (as hee concludeth) but himselfe teacheth thus very absurdly, and *M. Champney* doth according to *S. Tho.* teach vs, that to disobey (not to steale or kill) is to resist, contemne, or impugne the known commandement of a Superiour.



The authour of the *Apologie* proceedeth to the other part of the definition which *M. Champney* gaue of *disobedience*, and aproueth it, to wit, *That it must be a known precept*, and thereupon concludeth, that it doth goe hard with the fact of priestes, but doth not shew how they did disobey any *known precept* of any *Superiour*. He commendeth also the preuenting of an expresse commandement, by obeying, which no doubt is commendable: but if he inferre, that they doe sinne who doe not obey, vntill they are commanded, he will teach an absurd doctrine. *And this is* (saith he) *S. Tho. doctrine of this first kind of formal disobedience, whereby let any man consider the different spirit of S. Tho. about readie, willing, and simple obedience, from these our brethren, who in their first preface to the Reader, doe make a long speech, that authority of Superiours, is not a sure rule of truth to be followed without examination &c.* What doe we here with any &c? go on I pray you, and let vs heare out the sentence if there be any such sentence there: but the &c. came to stop this fellow from further falsifying the words cited out of the *preface to the Reader*. Can any man but this *Apologie-maker*, finde this sentence there, *that authority of Superiours is not a sure rule of truth to be followed without examination, &c.* as heere it is set downe in a different letter to deceiue the Reader? and in the margent there is this note to helpe it, *A perilous and scandalous doctrine of our brethren about obedience*. But because this fellow telleth his Reader, that he hath treated hereof before, in his second chapter, I referre the Reader to the answer there made vnto it, here only repeating that which is there affirmed, and will be iustified; that whosoever he is, that shall goe about to disproue that doctrine which is there giuen of obedience (as he calleth it) or of the faile which may be of truth in a *Superiour*, will prooue himselfe an asse or an heretike. And the foundation at the which he immediatly after throweth his cap, to wit, *that it is neither pietie, nor true obedience, at the first sight to admit any authoritie, but such as is orderly procured, and lawfully promulgated*, is no whit weakened with this idle question, *Who shalbe iudge of this?* For it is easily answered, that men of vnderstanding and learning may iudge, whether a thing bee *orderly procured, and lawfully promulgated*: and the iudgement was giuen for



for the priests, who not trusting to their owne learning, sent to *Paris*, where their iudgement was confirmed, and hath since also beene determined by his Holinesse, that howsoeuer it was *procured*, it was not *promulged* so as it bound the priests to obey it. Neither doth it therefore follow, that euery subiect is to examine his Superiours ordinances, nor is it absurd, that men seeing cause why they should doubt, should seeke to helpe themselves by dealing with their Superiour as the priests did, who presently vpon the first knowledge of this authoritie, perceiving what they did, sent to Rome to his Holinesse from whom it was said to come: when contrary to the custome and lawes of holy Church, it came without any his Holinesse letters, as it is after confessed in this *Apologie*.

Here he might alleage (he sayth) the whole course of ancient holy fathers sayings, about prompt, ready and simple obedience, most opposite and contradictory to this vaine doctrine of these our brethren. But if he meane the vaine of doctrine which he sayth is in the *Preface to the reader*, and is impugned by him as *perillous and scandalous doctrine*, then doubtlesse he cannot bring the saying of any ancient holy Father against it, nor of any Catholique new father. If hee meane that the priestes doe argue against *prompt and ready obedience*, as a matter not worthy commendations, he doeth but mocke his reader: for the priests doe highly commend it, as a most rare vertue. If he meane that the ancient holy fathers did so highly commend *prompt obedience*, as they did condemne all delayes to obey the commandement of a Superior, vpon what cause soeuer, as sinfull; hee is in a very grosse error. For as wee haue before cited out of the chapter, *Si quando de Rescriptis*, Pope Alexander the third, writeth this to the Archbishop of Rauenna. *Qualitatem negotij, pro quo tibi scribitur, diligenter considerans, aut mandatum nostrum reuerenter adimpleas, aut per literas tuas, quare adimplere non possis, rationabilem causam pretendas, quia patienter sustinebimus, si non feceris, quod praua nobis fuerit insinuatione suggestum.* Having considered vpon that for which wee write vnto you, either with reuerence fulfill our commandement, or pretend some reasonable cause, by your letters, why you cannot fulfill it. For we will beare it patiently if you shall not do that, which was suggested vnto vs with euill information or insinuation.



By which & other such authētical warrāts would al the corrolaries of *Gregory of Valēcia* be answered, if we should agree, that the priests were cōmanded any thing by a Superior, which they did not obey. But this can neuer be proued: for so soone as they did see his Hol. letters, they did obey, as it is sayd in the Popes owne letters, or *Breue* of the 17. of *August* 1601. And other Superior they know not, that could make an *Archpriest* among them, with these appertenances. Whether then it be sayd, that the Cardinal did it himselve, or that he sayd the Pope did it, it is not greatly materiall. For if it be sayd, that the Cardinal did it of himselve, wee aske by what authority? if you say by his owne: we say that he had none, or if he had, and had shewed it, he had bene obeyed. If it be said that the Pope did it; we aske how this appeareth? If you say, by the Cardinals testimonie, we say it was not sufficient to bind vnder sinne to obey it. And this is proued by *M. I. B.* in *The hope of peace* pag. 32. and 33 and by *M. Iohn Collington* at large in his first reason: and by *M. D. Ely* in his notes vpon the *Apologie*, who handleth this question from the 117. pag. to 233.

It followeth in the *Apologie*. And all this now is about the first kinde of formall disobedience wherein there must be some actuall contempt with reflection: which is, as out of *Caictane* you haue heard, an intention not to obey: and would to God this also were not too openly seene in this fact of our brethren, and their perseuerance therein. From this kinde then of disobedience it was for the priests to purge themselues, and from the imputation thereof. How vniustly then is *M. Champney* blamed, who to purge himselve of this kinde of disobedience did first shew what this disobedience is? Why is his doctrine carped at, when his aduersaries are forced to say no lesse then he sayd? That disobedience, as disobedience, or disobedience, wherewith he was charged, did imply contempt, resistance or impugnation &c. And to what end haue wee now a tale of a materiall disobedience, which is onely committed by stealing, or coueting, or by such like? Listen I pray you to another strange Lecture, which this *Apologie-maker* will giue you. But now besides this (formall kind of disobedience) there is another kind of materiall disobedience, when a man leaueth to doe that which is commanded, not with intention, or reflection, hee will not obey, or  
doth



doth contemne his Superiour, but onely that he doeth either omit that which was commanded, or doe some other thing contrary thereunto. And in this kind is it to be presumed, that the disobedience of Adam, Achan, Saul, and others were. Wee doe commonly vnderstand sinnes of omission, to be against affirmatiue precepts. It would therefore be explicated, what affirmatiue precepts were giuen to Adam, Achan, and Saul: or els this first kind of *materiall disobedience* might haue been spared, it being no more proper to *materiall disobedience* then to *formall*. And so doth Gregorie of Valencia affirme of *formal disobedience*. *Disp. 7. quæst. 3 puncto. 3. Frequenter autem eiusmodi in obedientia formalis per omissionem accidere potest &c. altera inobedientia formalis est per commissionem: Formall disobedience may often be committed by omission &c. And the other formall disobedience is by commission.* But to returne no more to this, It is euident that the commandement which God gaue to Adam concerning the apple, which commandement this author saith Adam did simply disobey, was a negative precept in this maner: *De ligno autem scientia boni & mali ne comedas. Eat not of the tree of knowledge of good and euill.* Likewise the commandement giuen to Achan was a negative precept. *Vos autem caute ne de hijs, qua precepta sunt (vobis) quicquam contingatis. Take heede you touch not any of those things which you are forbidden.*

The precept likewise which Samuel gaue to Saul, was a negative precept: *Non parcas ei, & non concupiscas ex rebus ipsius aliquid: Spare them not (the Amalekites) neither couet any thing which is theirs.* And consequently these sinnes were sinnes of commission, and not of omission, vnlesse we take omission so generally, as it may include all the sinnes in the world, for that by sinning, a man omitteth to fulfil that which he is commanded. In which sense, there is no sinne, but there is an omission, as a condition included in it: as Gregory of Valencia speaketh of *materiall disobedience* in the place cited, *Quæ materialis inobedientia nihil aliud est, quàm transgressio cuiuscunq; præcepti, in materia cuiusvis virtutis, atque ita non distinguitur ab alijs peccatis, sed est conditio quædam generalis, inclusa in omnibus peccatis, hoc ipso, quod peccatum omne est contra præceptũ. Materiall disobedience is nought else, but a transgression of euery precept, in the subiect or matter of*



euery vertue, inſomuch as it is not diſtinguiſhed from the other ſins, but is a certaine generall condition, included in all ſinnes, in that euery ſinne is againſt the commandement. Therefore although there be an *omiffion* included in euery ſinne, and the ſinner may iuſtly be ſaid to haue omitted, as there is a *diſobedience* in euery ſinne, and the ſinner may be ſaid to haue diſobeyed, yet is he no more to be ſaid, to haue ſinned by *omiffion*, then by *diſobedience*, but by doing this or that, for example, by *theft*, or *murther*, and ſuch like. This part then of *materiall diſobedience*, as our author calleth it, or as *Gregory of Valentia* ſayth of *formall diſobedience*, is ſhewed, not to haue place in the ſinne of *Adam*, *Achan*, & *Saul*: let vs ſee how handſomely their ſinnes will be deduced to the other branches of *materiall diſobedience*, which here this author ſpreadeth: or doe (ſayth he) *ſome other thing contrarie thereunto*, that is, contrary to that which is commanded. Now we are to aſke how, or in what ſort a man is ſaid to doe *ſome other thing contrary to that which hee is commanded*. If a man be bidden to goe vpon the right hand, hee is properly ſaid to doe ſome other thing contrary to that hee is commanded, if he goe vpon the left hand; for it is another thing, and it is contrary to the commandement. Likewise if a man be bidden to ſtand ſtill, and not mooue, if he doe runne, he doth ſome other thing contrary to the commandement: or if any other man can better explicate what it is, to doe ſome other thing contrary to a commaundement, I will willingly learne of him. This authour then, when he would reduce the ſinne of *Adam* to this kind of *materiall diſobedience*, who is to doe *ſome other thing contrary to that which was commanded*, in my vnderſtanding he knoweth not what he ſaith. *Adam* was commanded, that he ſhould not eate the apple: now I would know, what was *Adams* diſobedience. This author, fol. 111. affirmeth, that *Adam* did *ſimply diſobey by eating the apple which was forbidden*. But now what will hee ſay? for hee hath brought *Adams* offence in the roll of doing ſome other thing contrary to the commandement. And if *Adams* ſinne were nothing, but a ſimple diſobedience by eating the apple, as he ſayth fol. 111. then was not *Adams* ſinne a *materiall diſobedience* in that kind which here he putteth, becauſe he did no other thing contrary to that which was commaunded, but did the very ſame thing



thing which he was commanded he should not doe. Such likewise was the sinne of *Achan*, who being cōmanded not to touch any thing which belonged to the Amalekites, he did the very same thing which he was commanded he should not doe: and so did *Saul* likewise the very same thing, which he was forbidden to doe. So that the finnes of *Adam*, *Achan*, or *Saul*, were not *materiall disobedience*, vnlesse this authour can finde better meanes to prooue it, or to reduce them to some other braunch thereof, then here is specified, to wit, that hee committeth a *materiall disobedience*, who onely doeth either omit that which was commaunded, or doth some other thing contrary thereunto. And thus doeth he leaue the finnes of *Adam*, *Achan*, and *Saul*, and neither will haue them to be finnes of *formall disobedience*, nor is able to shew, how they were finnes of *materiall disobedience*. And yet he goeth on, and talketh, what diuines doe hold. Mary if you will haue this fellowes fauour, you must alwayes remember with *S. Thomas* before cited, that it is sufficient *the superiors will doe appeare quocunque modo, by what meanes soeuer*: that is, (according to this authors conceit) if you be told it, although it be in such sort, as you are not bound to giue any credit vnto it: which hath beene prooued very often to haue beene in our case, and also that by an insufficient testimonie the will of a Superiour cannot by any meanes appeare. And thus much in defence of *M. Champneys* definition of *disobedience*, with which he and his fellowes were charged.

The author of the *Apologie*, being (as it should seeme) driuen to a desperate point, beginneth to aduise the priests in this manner: *Well then, all this being presupposed, (a hote piece of seruice) and all heate of partialitie and passion layd aside, wee would aske our brethren in their consciences before God, and as at the day of iudgement they will and must answere truly and sincerely, when they had seene and read ouer Car. Caietans letters patent, wherein vnder his hand and scale, hee testified to them and the whole world, that in respect of the diuision and dissension raised in England betweene priests and Iesuits (I pray you bid the Iesuites welcome into the listes, although they seeme to haue stolne in here at the latter ending of the fray) or priests and priests, vpon that or other causes, and for continuation of discipline, union, and concord, his Hol. had resolved to*  
make



make a subordination, and had by a speciall commandement enioyned the same to him to be performed by his letters. And knowing further, that his Hol. not many moneths before (which the Card. repeated in his letters) had told the very same tale vnto diuers of them, at their departure from Rome, about these diuisions, exhorting and charging them most straightly, to haue vniõ and peace with all, & namely with the Fathers of the Societie, making the very like exhortation to them, which now the Cardinall did. All these things wee say concurring, and many others, as well letters from Rome, as men that came from thence, testifying this acte, and meaning of the Pope: and the very probabilitie and morall euidence it selfe, being so cleare, that no Card. would euer dare presume to doe, or attempt so publike an act vnder letters Patents, and that expresly in the Popes name, without sure commission: Here wee say, let our brethren tell vs sincerely, and without passion, was this morall certainty of the Popes will or not, or was this sufficient knowledge to binde, vnder sinne to obedience, or no? Was a Card. Protectors letters Patents, testifying his Hol. commaundement therein ynough to the condition required by S. Tho. vt superiorũ voluntas quocunque modo innotescat, That our Superiors will doe any waies appeare? But we will not vrgẽ this any further here, especially seeing Fa. Valent. his doctrine set downe before out of S. Thomas, doeth most clearly conuince them. And therefore we leaue that to God, and their consciences, to answere one day before the high Iudge, where shifts will haue no place. A condition, which I doubt not, but the author of this *Apologie* would gladly for this time should be agreed vpon, howsoeuer when that day shalbe present, he would be willing to haue the hearing of the matter further deferred. For if we doe but reflect what meanes haue bene made, to haue it heard in this world, and haue bene crossed by him, and his faction, we shall easily conceiue how vnwilling he will be to come to the triall in the next, where hee must come to the naked prooffe of right, or wrong without his cloake, which now couereth all his falsehood.

To this adiuration the priests will answere in their consciences afore God, and at the day of Iudgement, where shifts will haue no place, that when they had scene & read ouer the Card. *Caietanes* letter, which he testified not to the whole world (as  
here



here it is most falsly suggested ) but onely to *M. Blackwell*, being a letter written particularly to him , and to no other (as appeareth by the letter extant both in the bookes dedicated by the priests to the *Inquisition*, and at the beginning of *M. Colingtons* booke lately set forth) and written by one, who was not knowen to haue any Authority in England, neither did he make it knowen, that he had any authoritie delegated vnto him for that which he had attempted but only by his owne bare words, which no man in this case was to beleue vnder any sin ; Notwithstanding they had heard that his Hol. had giuen a charge to some in particuler, to haue peace with the Iesuits (a very impertinent matter, and as foolishly here vrged, for the band to accept the *Subordination* at the first comming ) or had seene other letters testifying the same, as a heare-say (as *M. Colington* doeth particularly prooue, from the 68. page to the 80. or that he was a Cardinal who writ his letters (it being euident, in the opinion of the chiefeest Cannonists, that a Card. may do more sometime then needeth, or els they would neuer accord, that credit is not to be giuen to him vnlesse he shew his commission,) whereupon your brethren doe answer *sincerely and without passion*, that it was no morall certaintie of the Popes will , and that they had not *sufficient knowledge to bind vnder sinne to obedience*, and that no *Superiours will did by any meanes appeare vnto them*, but rather a very bad part of their aduersaries to crosse them for a time , vntill they could worke the Pope to confirme the plot which they had layde, to bring the priests into a slavish bondage vnder them : neither can they once be conuincd of the contrary, as may in part appeare by that their reasons of their refusall before the *Breue* came, doe stand firme as yet vnanswered. And thus omitting to coniure the Iesuits, & Arch-priest for their false dealings in this action, for which assuredly they must come to an vnpleasing reckoning, I wil briefly touch what is here said of the censure of *Paris*, and make an ende of this Chapter, referring the Reader for a larger satisfaction to *M. D. Elie* his notes vpon the 8. Chapter of the *Apologie* pag. 245. and to *M. Iohn Colington* in his 4. reason pag. 153.

The decree of the doctors of *Sorbon* in *Paris* consisted of two parts; the one was that the priests who deferred to admit of



the authoritie vpon the causes alledged, were not *schismaticks*, the other was that the priests, (the fact of it selfe considered) did not any way offend, or commit sinne. By this definition of *Paris* (saith this author fol. 118.) commeth very little reliefe vnto the priests, and it was printed onely to make a vaine flourish with the ostentation of an *Academicall* sentence. This very word *Academie* sticketh marueilously in this authours stomach, and his fellows. But let vs see how he will shew that this decrec of these doctors did very little relieue the priests. To the first point that it was no *schisme*, what saith he? marke I pray you his words fol. 115. for of the other point of *schisme* we will not talke at all, & am sorie that cuer it was mentioned, or brought in questiō. But will you see this good lope of milke turned downe with a foule paire of heeles? Note that which is behinde. *Vnquiet* people hauing taken occasion hereby to continue contention, and to make more brables, then were needfull. They were much to blame belike who would speake being publicquely defamed for *schismaticks*, and what els a quintessence of malice could deuise, as may be scene in the treatise of *Schisme* written by the Iesuits, and aproued by the Archp. and yet to this day mainteined in corners, where any of that seditious crew can haue any hope to increase the *schisme* (or diuision, or what els it may be hereafter called) in Gods Church by perswading now some, now other some, not to communicate in Prayer, and Sacraments with those who are the true members of Gods Church, & for a cause in which these members doe inhere, and plead the commandement of the head of the Church, against a priuate letter, from a priuate Cardinal to a priuate man, as may appeare by the letter it selfe. Were shame of that most wicked and sencelesse slander, the cause of sorrow or silence in this author, concerning this point of *schisme*, what hope might there be that he had some grace? but his sorrow and silence grow both out of a splene, that his, and his fellowes slanderous tongues had not that successe, which he and his froward malicious adherents hoped for.

The submission which the priests did make at the sight of his Holines first Breue of the 6. of April 1599. (acknowledged in his later Breue of the 17. of August 1601.) conuinceth all but contentious, & brablers, that the priests were further off by much from



from any touch, or any suspicion of *schisme*, then their aduersaries here, euer since their first deuiding themselves from them in prayer, and communion of Sacraments. But seeing he will say no more of *schisme*, we will omit it, and come to the question, which this author meaneth to handle. *Our question* (saith he) *is then onely, whether any sinne were committed, whereof also we will not presume to determine any degree of sinne, but leaue that to God, and to the offenders consciences.* Now that the priests here be published for rebels, seditious, factious, excommunicate, irregular, fallen from the Church, to haue lost their faculties, scandalous, infamous persons, no better then soothsayers, and Idolaters, disobedient to the Church, and therefore as *Ethnickes* and *Publicanes*, the author of this *Apologie* will not presume to determine any degree of sinne.

*Our question* (sayth he) *is, whether any sinne were committed:* but he giueth no answer to this question, but wrangleth a little about the censure of *Paris* in this maner. First, *there was no man to enforme the Doctors for the Archpriest:* As though the Doctors censure had not passed vpon those informatiōs, although no one of any side had been present. The case was propounded, and they gaue their iudgement vpon the case, and not vpon any particular person. If any, that might haue bene then present for the Archpriest, could haue proued the case, to haue been wrong put, let it now be done, and it shall be all one: For as it is sayd, it was the case, which was censured, which might haue come out of *Moscouia*, for any thing that was set downe to the contrary, in the information. And the decree being giuen, according to the information, will be iustified, notwithstanding this sencelesse and shameful *Edict*. *We George Black-* 29. Maij 1609.  
*well Archpriest of England, and protonotary apostolicall &c. do strictly command in vertue of obedience, and vnder paine of suspension from diuine offices, and losse of all faculties in the fact it selfe to be incurred, all ecclesiasticall persons, and also all Lay Catholikes vnder* A notorious  
viurper.  
*paine of being interdicted likewise in the fact it selfe to bee incurred.* Is not this a strange charge considering the state, in which as well the *Lay Catholike*, as the *Ecclesiasticall person* now liueth in England? Who is it that doeth not expect a prohibition of some grieuous crime? You haue heard the charge, Now listen



to the matter forbidden: *That neither directly nor indirectly they maintaine, nor defend in word, or writing, the censure of the Vniuersitie of Paris, whether it be truly giuen or forged.* Was there euer in Christendome heard the like presumption, that a man of some two or three yeres study, and in no Catholike *Academie* of fame should condemne the censure of the most famous Vniuersity in Christendome? But wil you heare him excel himselfe, who hath excelled the most proud, and temerarious censurer in the world? Note that which he addeth, *whether vpon true informations, or otherwise* the Sorbonists haue spun a faire threed, when what informations soeuer be giuen vnto them, their censure is not to be regarded.

The second exception which this author seemeth to take, is *that the Doctōrs did lightly passe it ouer, and defined the matter in the senior Bedels house,* which such as haue studied in *Paris*, do know to be the vsuall place of their meeting, as standing most commodiously for all those, who are chosen to meete vpon all causes, comming to the Vniuersitie to be determined, they themselves not liuing in any one place, but scatteringly in the Citie: Religious men in their Couents; Pastors in their parishes; Readers, and other Doctōrs in their seuerall houses, or Colledges. How lightly they passed it ouer I know not, neither is the matter of any such difficultie in it selfe, that it should aske great studie. But it is an argument that they were not ouer carelesse, what they sayd, who commanded the *Bedell* to write it downe, as their definition in such wise, as euery thing els doeth passe them, in their consultations of greatest matters.

The third exception is, *that it was giuen vpon some sinistrous information: and that therefore the Doctōrs did prudently giue their censure in this maner: They committed no sinne at all in that fact in it selfe considered.* And that they added these words, *for that they knew not what scandall, euill example, sedition, and contention and hurt to the common cause had ensued thereof.* Had this author in place of this word *thereof* put *after*, he had done more wisely, as I thinke: for in that he vseth this word *thereof*, either he declareth himselfe to be very sottish, or els that the Vniuersitie was very vnaduised in adding these words: *that fact in it selfe considered*, for which words this author commendeth their wisdom:  
for



for if the fact in it ſelfe, were ſuch, as ſo much hurt did enſue thereof, how could the fact in it ſelfe be cleared from all ſinne? True it is that ſcandal followed *after*. But it yet remaineth unproued, that it enſued vpon the priſts fact: doeth not much hurt come after much good? and ſhall we ſay that the harme enſued vpon the doing of the good, in ſuch ſenſe, as that the good which is done, muſt be a neceſſary cauſe of the euil, which had not perchance otherwiſe been? The fact then in it ſelfe conſidered being without ſinne, we are to ſeeke who ſowed the *Zizania*, which perchance had neuer been ſowed where it was, had not the husbandman ſowed good corne before.

The priſts perceiuing what was intended, and was likely to fall vpon them, if they ſought not ſome meanes to preuent it, ſent two of their brethren vnto his Holines, to preuent it if they might (for contrary to all cuſtom in Chriſtendome, there was a ſuperioritie challenged ouer all England and Scotland, as deriued from the Sea Apoſtolike, without any letters from the ſaid Sea for warrant thereof) and in the meane time the priſts deferred their ſubmiſſion to the authoritie, as well vpon this cauſe as other contained in the information to the Doctors of *Sorbon*.

The Ieſuits and their faction (of which the Archpriſt being now become the head) were impatient of delay: and becauſe the priſts did not ſubiect themſelues in this *interim*, but ſtayed their ſubmiſſiō vntill they did ſee the Popes letters, they firſt vſed their tongues, then their penneſ, and both writ, and approoued ſeditious libels againſt the priſts, tearing them therein *Schiſmatikes, excommunicate perſons, irregular, fallen from the Church of God*, and what not, that malice it ſelfe could deuife: from which ſlanders, while the Priſts fought to defend themſelues, great troubles haue riſen in England. Now then the queſtion muſt be, whether the Priſts were the ſinfull cauſe of theſe contentions, by this their forbearance, to ſubiect themſelues before they ſawe the Popes letters, or rather the Ieſuites and Archpriſt by thoſe their ſeditious and ſinnefull tongues, and libels? *The fact of the Priſts in it ſelfe conſidered*, that is, their forbearance vpon ſuch cauſes, ſay the doctors, and prudently (ſayth this author) *was no ſinne at all*, but the doctors were not



truly informed (sayth this author) and therefore their sentence was of no force.

But what then were the defects in the information giuen to the doctors, through which the doctours are thought to haue erred in their sentence? Forsooth, first *the priests did not tell them, that the Card. was Protector of the nation.* What if the priests did not know, that he was *Protector of the nation*, when his letters came into England, but onely *Protector* of the English Colledge at Rome, as his predecessour was intituled, and neuer known by any other title, as may appeare by the *Bull* of Pope Gregory 13. for the institution of that Colledge, and the Thesis either in Philosophie or Diuinitie, which were in the publike exercises dedicated vnto him? Moreouer, it is euident, that this which this Card. *Protector* did, hee did it by a delegation from his Hol. and not as a *Protector*, and therefore it had bene impertinent to haue said, that he was *Protector*, and neither titles doe multiply the person, nor any one person carrieth that credit, that in al like cases he must be beleeued, except his Hol.

The second defect which this author findeth, was, *that these doctors were not told, that the Card. did all this expresse mandato, by his Holines expresse commandement, which* (sayth this authour) *the Card. setteth downe cleerely in his letters.* To this I answere, that the Cardinall setteth downe such words in his letters, but he setteth them downe onely in that place, where hee is commanded to labour or endeaour, that there should be peace in all other places, as there was at that time in the English Colledge at Rome. And he that should haue informed the doctors of Sorbon, that the Cardinals letters doe testifie either cleerely, as is here said, or obscurely, that *he did all which here he did, concerning this subordination or institution of this Archpresbyterie, expresse mandato, by an expresse commandement of his Hol. had ben similis vobis mendax,* and there had bene no trueth in him in this point.

The third defect which this authour noteth, was, *that they concealed another thing uttered also* (sayth this author) *in the Cardinals letters.* And what was that? to wit, *that a subordination was demanded by priests letters to his Holines, and that his Hol. had allowed of their reasons.* To this I answere, as to the former, that



that the Card. did not vtter this in his letters, as may appeare alſo by the letters themſelues, but by this he giueth his reader to vnderſtand, what ſubſtantiall informations ſome agent for the Archpriest ſhould haue giuen at *Paris* in his behalfe againſt the prieſts, and how ſhameleſly theſe and ſuch like would haue beene there vttered, which are without all ſhame ſet foorth in print for all poſteritie to ſee, that their ſureſt ancre by which they hold, is a graceleſſe boldneſſe to auerre any thing, and a blinding their adherents, that they ſhall not finde their falſe dealing.

The fourth exception which this author taketh at the information, is, that it was giuen, *that many refuſed to ſubſcribe, whereas they were not the twentieth part.* This difficultie we will entreate ſome Grammer boy to aſſoile, and to put it into the author of the *Apologie*, in what number may be *many*. But in the meane while, we ſhall conſider how the Jeſuites flattered with ſome, threatned other ſome, and yet were forced to preſume vpon others, and thereupon ſet others names to billes, without their conſent or priuitie. And if to this I ſhal ioyne the courſe which the Archpriest tooke to compell men, to take him for their *Superiour* at the firſt, when he had no other warrant for it then a Cardinals priuate letter, and particularly directed to him onely (as may appeare by the letter it ſelfe) and compare this part of ſubſcribers, with thoſe whoſe vnreadineſſe in this action, was a ſufficient argument of their mindes, the number of the willing ſubſcribers will be found much fewer then the other: yet was not the information giuen at *Paris* in any ſuch ſort, as this author enlargeth himſelfe, to wit, *as though they had ben a great multitude, or the maior part*, as the information it ſelfe doth ſhew. Neither did the Doctours cleare the prieſts, in any conſideration of *multitude*, but in conſideration of *the fact in it ſelfe* as appeareth in their decree, which conſideration dependeth not vpon *how many*, or *how few*, but vpon the lawfullneſſe of *the fact it ſelfe*. And whereas this authour addeth, *that if the Prieſts haue encreaſed their number ſince, it hath bene by falſe information, as this was to the Doctours of Sorbon, and by perſwading them to the participation of their libertie, and freedome from all gouernment, which is a ſore bayte for young men, as all the world knoweth:*



*eth.* If the Priests haue not encreased their number, or were not knowen ( when this *Apologie* was written ) to haue encreased their number, how can he so peremptorily affirme, that *those, who refused to subscribe at the first, were not the twentieth part* so many, hauing set their hands to the appeale? And yet many more standing firme with them, whose names are not there expressed, and yet are so many more, (if they knew how to liue in any reasonable sort, without holding with the Iesuits and the Archpriest in this controuersie ) as they would leaue a very poore *many* to stand against the Secular priests: Such the *baytes* are, and so vnpleasant which are layd to drawe them to the priests side, as they haue no list to byte at them. The priests haue for Gods cause, put themselves in such state of life, as they stand in neede of the charitie of Catholikes, who being abused by the Iesuits and the Archpriest, to disfaueur all such as they dislike, and to relieue onely those, who shall stand with them: It is easily seene where the *bayte* is, at which a yong man will byte, besides the infamie which is continually spread abroad against the Priests, that were it not, to betray God his Church, and their own soules, no doubt they had rather themselves byte at the golden *bayte*, and worldly fauour which the Iesuites and the Archpriest doe lay, to catch young and olde, both of the Laytie and the Clergie, then at a crust, as some of them doe call it: and to liue so obscurely as many of them do, yea and in great want, which patience onely doth often supply ( a sorry *bayte for young men* ) as all the world doth knowe. And this is a silly disposition to be perswaded by any false information, especially in such matters, as of which they are themselves eye-witnesses, how they are handled, and cannot easily be deceiued.

The fifth exception is against the *information*, where it is said, *that the priests refused onely to subscribe to the authoritie of the Archpriest, before he had obtained letters from the sea apostolike for his confirmation: as who would say, that this being done, they ment to be quiet.* This good fellow should haue disproued this and that, at the sight of his Holinesse *Breue*, of the 6. of *April 1599* all matters were not appeased, and that the Priests did not ( according to this information giuen ) submit themselves. But  
this



this he can neuer doe, for he will be disproved by his Holinesse himselfe, who in his *Breve* of the 17. of *August. 1601.* affirmeth it. And their behauiour in the meane time, was as became Catholike priests, who had care to preserve their credite, in such sort as they were bound to do, without perswading any against the Popes ordination, or discrediting any letters of the *Protector*, more then this, that they would not giue any such credite vnto the *Protector*, that they would without his Holines letters subiect themselves to an extraordinary superioritie; to which without grieuous penalties, no Couent or Clergie are to subiect themselves, as may appeare in that *Extrauag* of *Bonifacius* the eight *Iniunctum de electione*, which is afterward extended by Pope *Iulius* the third in his constitution which beginneth thus, *Sanctissimus, &c.* to all Prelates. Although also in farre lesser matters then this was, no Cardinall will challenge any such prerogative to himselfe, that his word or his letter should stand for a law, to bind all men to whom the matter appertaineth, to yeeld their obedience *under sinne*. And both falsely and foolishly it is here vrged, that it was the Popes ordination. First because the Cardinall affirmed in his letters, that it was his owne ordination, as may appeare in those words of his letter, *Dum hæc nostra ordinatio durauerit, so long as this our ordination shall endure.* Secondly because although his Holinesse did declare, that it was done by his commandement, yet this declaration came not in a yeere after, and could giue no more notice to the Priests before that hee did any thing therein, then this authour of the *Apologie* hath knowledge at this present, by any lesson which may be taught him a yeere hence, and yet cannot but thinke it great folly, to be charged for not beleeuing that, at this present, of which hee is not like to haue sufficient knowledge, any time these twelue moneths following. But now to the *terrors* which the priests are said to haue cast into Lay mens heads, of admitting forraine authority from the Pope: I answer that the priests did only cast, as in wisdom they might, whether it were conuenient for them vpon so small a matter, as was a Cardinals letter, to incur the penalties of such lawes as were before of force among the Catholikes. For their submission to the *Breve* (so soone as they saw it) proued their rea-



die obedience, and reuerence to the Popes authoritie, which they are often, but falsely charged to haue resisted.

The sixt is, *that the doctors were told, that it might be scene by the Card. letters, that the Archpriests authoritie was granted by false information*; A point largely proued by the priests & the place of the Cardinals letter, quoted in all their bookes, and *that partialitie was vsed in the choise of him and his assistants*. Which clause this author hath set downe in such sort, as his reader must conceiue, that the priests had informed the doctors, how that this also might be scene in the Card. letters; which is a false imputation: for the priests did not informe the doctors, that any such thing appeared in those letters, but onely that they had noted that there was *such a partialitie vsed* (as may appeare in their informations) without any relation to the Cardinals letters. And no man can better iustifie this to the doctors to be true, then he to whom in presence M. Blackwell tooke exceptions, for wishing some matters were amended in the Iesuits, and told him that it was the onely cause why hee missed an assistancehip. And F. Garnet dissembled not the matter in his letter of the 11. of Nouember 1598. to M Collington; where he maketh this conclusion about the middle of the letter, *So that if they would haue themselues, or others that doe not affect vs, (though otherwise seeming neuer so vertuous) to be chosen heads, let them first affect vs so farre, as in vertue they ought, that they may be worthy of gouernment*. And at the beginning of this Chapter of the *Apologie*, fol. 99. the principall counsellors in this action, are said to haue bene F. Parsens, and F. Baldwin open Iesuits, M. James Standish a secret Iesuit, or one at the least, who had promised to become a Iesuit, M. Haddock, and M Martin Array, who hauing forsaken their course of life in the helpe of their countrey, lay to deserue some preferment by the Iesuits their procurement, and haue since bene payde their hire, the one with the deanrie of Dullin, and the other with a prouostship in Spaine. And doth not this cōfirme that which the priests did most iustly suspect, to wit, *partialitie in the choise of the Archpriest, and his assistants*? The readines of the priests to obey (here againe objected to haue bene a false information) is proued by the Popes Breue of the 17. of August 1601. The matters concerning the two priests  
their



their iourney, their restraint, the iudgement of the two Card. against them, the breaking forth of these present troubles after the peace made, are to be handled in the Chapter following, and are here very impertinently brought by this author, as also that it was said (*God knoweth out of what office,*) when speech was of *Fa. Parsons* his procuring the *Breue* of the 6. of April, which words, as it hath bene shewed, were no discredit to his Hol. *Breue*, it being acknowledged by the priests out of what office soeuer it was gotten, and the words imply no more, then that it might be gotten out of diuers offices, and that *Fa. Parsons* might vse his talent, to haue matters set downe therein for his best aduantage, whereupon perchance it fel out, that the letters of the Cardinal were mistaken in the *Breue*, as all the world may see, and it is particularly said where, in the booke dedicated to the *Inquisition* pag. 59.

After this exception, there is yet againe a refreshing of the memory of the priests *their pride and arrogantie*, (for he draweth now to an ende of his question which he proposed fol. 115. to wit, *whether any sinne were committed by them, whereof* (he saith) *he will not presume to determine any degree of sinne*) *their making a dangerous diuision among Catholicks, in the sight of the common enemy, and in time of persecution, and would not be brought from it by authoritie, or gentle perswasions, whereof infinite hurts, scandals, and other damages, haue and doe dayly ensue.* And if any man had proposed the state of the question in this sort, *is it likely* (saith he) *that so learned, & godly Catholicke men, would haue defined, that their fact had incurred no sinne at all?* Is not this a pretie resolution of the question, which he had promised, pag 115. that is, *whether any sinne were committed by the priests their forbearance to yeeld their obedience, at the first sight of the Card. his letter?* I would aske this question, when *M. Blackwell* himselfe sent first for *M. Collington*, and *M. Charnocke*, and could not with all his threatnings, obtaine of them to say, that they did like of that which was done; what of all these matters here rehearsed by this author, were then to be obiected against their fact? If answere be made, that afterward these things chanced, which would not haue chanced, had all submitted themselues at the first: This answere is not to the matter: For we aske the question of the fact



in it selfe considered. And before these diuisions among Catholicks began, what was to be thought thereof? Will you heare this author his owne confession in this place. *And yet (saith he) is their (the doctors of Paris) definition so limitted, that they determine onely of the fact in it selfe, and this also, according to the present information giuen them, excluding all other circumstances and considerations, that doe or may aggrauate the same.* But what were these *circumstances, and considerations*? Were they any other then the tumults which are here so often inculcated? If they were, let them be specified, and they shalbe answered. If they were not any other then these stirres, then how could these vitiate an acte before they were; the acte in it selfe considered, was not vicious, but lawfull, (as here is auouched by the doctors) and lawfully done; and consequently (to end this Chapter) all the euill which followed, was by the misgouernment of the Archpriest, and the busines of his adherents the Iesuits, and such as stood with them, to defame the priests. And so for this matter, as the *Apologie* saith, *We end.*

## CHAP. 14.

*How this Apologie-maker perswadeth his reader, that his Hol. was mooued to imprison the two priests who went first to Rome, by certaine letters which were written long after his resolution to imprison them, and how hee iugleth about that which chanced vnto them in Rome. Apol. c. 9.*

**I**N the ninth Chapter of the *Apologie*, the author thereof promiseth to shewe, how after the first contradiction made by the priests, against his Holinesse ordinance (as hee falsely termeth it, if the Cardinall said true in his letters, *Dum hac nostra ordinatio durauerit: So long as this our ordinance shall endure*) the Priests went forward, and sent a couple to Rome: and what happened vnto them: (in which the poore man committeth very grosse faults) and how his Holines confirmed the aforesaid ordinance, and Protectors letters with a new Breue, (which is an argument that the ordinance was not his Holines ordinance, for then should it



it not haue needed any confirmation) hee beginneth his ninth Chapter in this manner. *We haue shewed (a brazen face) in the former Chapter, with how great singularitie and little reason (and yet not one answered) our discontented brethren (not without iust cause) being so fewe, and such as they were, yet so many, and such, as their aduersaries as yet neuer durst aduenture to buckle with them in the matter in question, holding it greater wisdom for them to keepe silence, then bewray their ignorance and folly, as this author hath aduentured in this Apologie, opposed themselves at the beginning to the first institution of this hierarchie, ordained by his Holines; a point often vrged, but neuer proued, there being nothing but the Cardinals bare testimonie, and some heare-sayes, which the priests haue shewed was not sufficient, to prooue that it was the Popes ordinance. Besides, (as it is said) the Cardinall tooke it vpon himselfe, as may appeare by his letters: and against the whole body of our English Clergie, besides themselves, admitting the same, beleeuing the protestations of some, that it was his Holines ordinance, not hauing seen themselves the Cardinals letters, and being put in a fright to be excommunicated, if they would not yeeld themselves. Now it remaineth to consider with what resolution and obstinacie, they haue prosecuted this their diuision, (the priests affirme, that this is the Iesuits diuision, and the faction adhering vnto them) notwithstanding all the meanes used to diuert them from it, and quiet them, both by superiours commandements, and friends perswasion. These friends perchance were they, who diuulged them to be schismatikes, and the superiour commaunded them that they should not defend themselves, and their fame, (special meanes for quietnesse.) And first of all, about this point is to be noted, that if our said brethren had meant plainly and sincerely (as often they doe professe in the two first discourses of their English booke, intituled, Copies of discourses, &c. and in their Information to the doctors of Paris, they doe auouch the same:) to wit, that their scruple was onely, whether this matter came from his Hol. or no? And whether Card. Caiet. the Protector (abusing the Popes name) had appointed it of himselfe, and that they deferred only to concurre with the rest of their brethren, untill they might be acertaind of this point. Well, good sir, if all this had beene so, as so it was not,*



but the priests professions in the places cited, are either ignorantly, or maliciously misreported, as shall be shewed, *It had bene a very easie matter to cleare the doubt by many wayes, yea without sending any to Rome, for that so publique an acte as this, under a Cardinals letters patents, might haue easily bene enquired of without messengers.* To what purpose should they haue inquired at Rome for the Cardinals letters, which they saw here in England? *patents*, that is to say, priuat letters, directed to a priuate man, for so were the Cardinals: the priests had no doubt of the Cardinals good will, to further any designe of the Iesuites, neither did they euer doubt, but that hee had instituted the authoritie, and therefore this was not the cause of their sending to Rome, to be informed, whether the Cardinall had done any such matter, for it was very credible, that he would haue done much more then he did (if he had knowen how) at the Iesuites request: but what were the other meanes? *One letter of their owne either to his Holines himselfe, or to Card. Adebrandino his nephew, or any acquaintance of theirs that was in Rome, might soone haue procured them a certificate of this matter, if they had bene desirous to haue knowen the trueth; yea further, no man was there of the contrarie part it selfe, which in this behalfe would not haue endeauoured to haue procured them satisfaction.* Good natures, who would so friendly haue vsed the priests letters, & yet did cause the priests to be cast into prison: and lest that they should haue missed of their purpose, they came themselues with the *Sbirri*, but they were the chiefe captains, and apprehended them, and were their guard to their prison: What if the Priests letters to his Hol. or his nephew, had miscarried (as ordinarily it is ominous to all such letters as passe by the Post, and are suspected not to be to the Iesuits liking) might not his Holines haue bene induced to confirme the Cardinals acte, as a matter applauded by all the Priests in England? *If (sayth this author) our brethren had meant plainely and sincerely (as often they doe professe in the two first discourses of their English booke, entituled, Copies of discourses, &c. and in their Information to the Doctors of Paris, they do auouch the same; to wit, that their scruple was only, whether this matter came from his Holines or no, &c.* Hath this author too soone forgotten his paine and trauaile taken in the precedent Chapter,



Chapter, where hee brought diuers *scruples* by way of arguments, for the proouing of the Priests their delay to be lawfull, of which fol. 110. this hee affirmeth: *And these reasons are set downe and printed in two of the first Treatises of the English booke, entituled, Copies of discourses, &c.* Hath hee not spent paper and inke, and a great deale of foolish labour, in going about (fol. 116. to the end of the Chapter) to disprooue, and cannot, the scruples which were suggested by the priests to the doctors of *Sorbon*, and will he now tell his reader, that the priests doe professe, both in these Treatises, and in their Information to the doctors of *Paris*, that *their scruple was onely, whether this matter came from his Holines or no?* Is his memory so short? or is his presumption such of the *blind-obedient*, that hee may say what he list, and contradict it at his pleasure? yet with all these arguments to the contrary, the priests as well in these *Discourses*, as in their *Information* to the doctors of *Sorbon*, affirmed, that his Hol. commaundement lawfully made knowen vnto them, should end the matter: which was no prooffe, that they had no other scruple, but rather of their ready obedience to the Sea Apostolicke, notwithstanding any difficulties, which did or might occurre, and were specified in these *Discourses*, and in the *Information* to *Paris*: and they performed it with all humilitie and charitie, by submitting themselves, and forgetting those most impious slanders, which had beene spread against them of *schisme*, &c. by the Iesuits, and had lien still to this day in their graue, had not the Iesuits raised them againe, and the Archpriest giuen them free scope, to range in euery seditious mouth without controlment, and for the greater encouragement to such ouerforward *Amalekites*, he published a *Resolution*, which he said he had from the *mother Citie*, that the refusers of his authoritie were *schismaticks*.

This then which this author affirmeth to haue been the *onely* scruple of the priests their delay, being prooued not to haue been the *onely* scruple, but that there were many more, which this author took notice of in the places cited in the 8 chapter: it is euident, that the sending of letters to Rome had litle auailed the priests, the letters themselves (if they had been deliuered to his Holinesse hands) not being able to haue answered



to the deuises of such aduersaries, as they had there found, and consequently it was necessary, that some priests should be sent to deale with his Holinesse in such doubts, as they had, with this resolution, that they would stand to whatsoeuer his Holinesse should iudge conuenient for the present. And in this maner did the two priests goe to Rome. And now followeth the story of their apprehention there by the *Iesuites and Sbirri*, and what chanced vnto them, while they were vnder the Iesuites safe keeping. And because the blame of that which deserueth blame, is layd to *Fa. Parsons*; as that *they were imprisoned before they were heard*, and such like, this author to saue *Fa. Parsons* his sides (of which, by his running so quickly out of the fire of persecution in England, he knew *Fa. Parsons* had a very great care) goeth about to proue, that the two priests, there imprisoned in Rome (before they were heard) *did not procede from Fa. Parsons*; and if he had gone no further then this, hee might haue left the matter in some suspence, and men might haue beaten their braines in conceiuing how such an iniustice should haue come into his Holinesse head, but he will demonstrate *how it came*, and thereby prooue that *Fa. Parsons* was no medler in it, to wit, *that diuers did write to his Holinesse against them*, but alacke their writing, although it might haue somewhat excused *Fa. Parsons*: yet doeth it not shew that *F. Parsons* was cleare. Hee argueth, as though it had bene an impossible matter for him to haue dealt in this action, because *so many other did write*: but what if all these writers writ nothing concerning that point, with which *Fa. Parsons* is charged; to wit: *the imprisonment of the two priests before they were heard*, to whom shall this fact be attributed? to his Holinesse, who is knowen to be both of mild, and most religious disposition, or to one of a cleane contrary spirit, but in that place, and credit, as he hath been trusted, both by his Holinesse, and vsed by the Cardinall *Caietane, Protector*, as a chiefe director in all our English affairs? But of this there can be no doubt, but that *many did write* to some, or other, and those letters were perchance shewed to the Pope, or els he heard somewhat of them. Let vs then examine this matter. The first place of the *letter writers* is giuen to his Holinesse *Nuntij in France and Flanders*. But in this he hath not done



done wisely, they being both strangers, and likely to haue had litle commerce with the English, especially hee in *France* (if then there were any) and as for him in *Flanders*, I am certainly informed from his owne mouth, that he neuer writ against these Priests, much lesse would he suggest, that they were *to bee imprisoned before they were heard*, and be vsed, as shalbe declared. The next letters here mentioned (although not for such as should perswade his Holines to that course, which was taken) were written by *Fa. Bellarmine*, wherein he certifieth *Fa. Parsons*, that his Holinesse so greatly misliked their troublesome facte, that he had told him, that *if they came to Ferrara hee would cause them to be imprisoned*: who gaue these informations to his Holinesse, that without more adoe hee was resolved to imprison them, if they had come to *Ferrara*? If the memory of some, who read the letter, doe not extraordinarily faile them, this was an answer to *Fa. Parsons* letter, which he had written to *Fa. Bellarmine*, concerning the Priests comming towards the Pope: But yet there is a starting hole left, and where is that? the letters of many of our nation, some of the *principall*, some of the most *zealous*, and herehence the Pope tooke his motiue *to imprison the priests*. If this then be so, then must these letters be written at the least, before that his Holines could by these writers perswasions determine, to cast the two priestes in prison, and yet not so long before, as it should be impossible that the writers could vnderstand of any such attempts, against which they are sayd to write, or to perswade his Holines to this or that course in this or that matter, but neither of these chanced in our present case. For all the letters (at the least brought heere for prooffe or instance) were written either after that his Hol. was induced to make this resolution, or else so long before, as it was impossible the writers thereof should haue knowledge of any such attempt.

The first in the ranke of writers is *D. Stapleton*, who (as this author thinketh) *was dead before the two priests came into Flanders* (he forgot himselfe that he had sayd fol. 120, that the priests came not into *Flanders*, but passed by *France*. But (alacke) the good mans memorie doth much faile him.) How then? what is to bee sayd of him, and his opinion, concerning these two



priests, and their attempts against the *Subordination*? and how was he one, vpon whose information, or instigation his Holinesse resolued *to imprison the two priests*? marie sir, you must goe looke in the 4. Chapter fol 40. a piece of a letter of D. Stapletons to *Fa. Parsons* which was written the sixt of *July* 1597. but what doth, or can this concerne the priests comming to his Holines, toward the later end of the yeere 1598, to deale about a matter which was not before the 7 of *March* in the same yere 1598, as appeareth by the date of the Cardinals letter, *Apologie ca. 8. fol. 104*? There is also a piece of another letter of the same man to the Cardinal *Protector*, of the first of *May* 1598, which although it were written after that the *Subordination* was instituted, yet it was written before that it was knowen in England: for (to our remembrance) we had no knowledge thereof, vntill it was *May* here with vs. But howsoeuer this was, it was impossible, that it could concerne the two priests their comming to his Holines, for this was not so suddenly determined in England, although vpon the first sight of the Cardinals letter the Archpriest was told, that there was iust cause for them, to goe to his Holinesse. By this then it appeareth, that D. Stapletons letters, which were to *Fa. Parsons* and to the *Protector*, could not induce his Holinesse, *to imprison the two Priests*, who came to deale about the *Subordination*. Let vs now see what the second testimony auaieth him. This testimony was of *principall men*, who writ *some moneths* (saith this author fol. 124.) *before these two messengers came ouer into Flanders* (he sayd France 120.) *but their negotiations in England were heard of, and knowen*, and these *principall men* (of whom the most *principall* standeth for the priests, and is ioyned with them in affection, and action in Rome at this present) writ their letter to the general of the Iesuites vpon this voice, which they heard, *when you doe iustice, you shal make also peace*, (a heauy saying for such as will bee prooued to haue done as great an iniury as may be, by a publike diffamation of *schisme*, and what not, against Catholike priests, without iust cause.) But what is this to the purpose? how was his Holinesse vpon this letter resolued *to imprison the two priests*, who were in the way to him, for and concerning the *Subordination* which was made? the Generall perchance of the Iesuits did shew this letter



letter to his Holinesse, and thereby the negotiations of these two, and their fellowes came also to be knowne to his Holines: all this goeth very currant. But what if those men (now become *principall*) neither heard of these 2. priests (as dealers in this action) nor of any other, not onely not in particular, but neither in general? What if they could not possibly heare, that there was any *Subordination* knowne in England, and much lesse, that any did delay to admit thereof, when they writ this letter to the Generall of the Iesuits? How shamelesse will this author be iudged, who would bring these *principall* men their letters, as a motiue to his Holinesse, *to imprison these two priests*, before he would heare what they had to say? This *Subordination* was made at Rome the seuenth of *March* in the yere 1598, and if the messenger had stridden a blacke horse to bring it into Englād, yet could there not be any negotiations in England conueniently either by these two priests, or others concerning the same, in so short a time, as that these 17 *principall* men (vnlesse they were altogether attending, as it were to haue entertained the same messenger in Flanders) considered maturely of the negotiations, which were in England, could burnish vp a letter, and dispatch it vpon the eighteenth of *March*, in the same yeere 1598, as here is cited in the margent fol. 123.

Now follow the letters of diuers *zelous men*. When (as this author saith) *these messengers were in their way indeed* (for the other were written, especially those of the 17. *principall* men, when the priests were in their negotiations, before they set forward, as it is said fol. 124.) & these men writ indeed very sharply, and with such confidence, as they might giue some suspicion to a wise man, that all was not well in England, but yet there is no perswasion to haue the messengers cast into prison, vntill they were heard: a duetie which they might challenge, if in no other respect, yet at least for their trauaile in Gods Church, for which they deserued a good opinion of the gouernours thereof. The first here cited are from *Doway* 25. *Octob.* 1598. to the *Protector*; to which some haue acknowledged their error in subscribing. These letters doe not cleare *Fa. Parsons* for being the cause of his Holines resolution *to imprison the two priests*: for in this *Apologie* it is confessed fol. 120, that his Holines was resol-



ued vpon the 17. of *October* 1598. to cast them into prison, for such date doeth the letter beare, which *F. Bellarmine* (now Cardinal) is said to haue written to *Fa. Parsons*, to informe him, that his Holines so greatly misliked their troublesome fact, that hee had told him, that if they came to *Ferrara*, he would cause them to be imprisoned. If these then of the 25. of *Octob.* came too late, to put such a resolution into his Holines head, what shall wee say of these which came after? for the next letters are from *M. D. Worthington* to the *Protector*, and these beare date the 30. of *October* from *Bruxels*. Next *March D. Peerse* (who was the first in the ranke of the 17. principall men, but now God knoweth, what place he shall haue, and among whom, for that he is ioyned with the priests in *Rome*, and in that action) *D. Caesar Clement*, that succeeded *D. Stapleton* in the office of assistance-ship to the *Nuntius* in *Flanders*, in all English affaires (a man that was neuer in England, but (to giue him his right) the fittest man for that purpose, as matters go, and worthy to succeed *D. Stapleton*, or any farre greater man then he, in that kinde of managing English affaires) *D. Richard Hall*, three doctors, but what these, or other writ most earnestly, and grauely to the same effect, as the other did, by al likelyhood this author knoweth not: For (as he saith) he had not the copies of their letters, when he writ this *Apologie*, but hee met with a letter of *M. Licentiat Wright*, deane of *Cortrac* in *Flanders* to the *Protector*, which is here set downe in the *Apologie*, wherein this deane hath litle cause to thanke this author, who would discredit him so much, as to set downe his iudgement of two priests, whom he neuer saw. And although his letter doe exceed the limits of all modestie, yet doeth it not any whit auaille this author for prooffe of that, for which it is brought, that is, that his Holines was thereupon resolved, to imprison the two priests: for this letter beareth date 10. *Novembis* 1598, as appeareth here fol. 126, which was a faire while after his Holines had that resolution, as appeareth by *F. Bellarmine* (now Card.) his letter of the 17. of *Octob.* 1598. cited by this author fol. 120. yet goeth this fellow on very smoothly, and not without great applause of the blinde obedient in this manner.

*By this then (saith he) and other letters that came to his Holines*  
(as



(as you must suppose) or to the Protector (he should haue added, or to the generall of the Iesuits, or to Fa. Parsons, for all these here related, are to some of these, and not one to his Holines, nor all to the Protector, nor about these matters, as in their places it is confessed in the *Apologie*) about this time, and were related to his Holines by him (his Holines being all this while at Ferrara, and the Cardinall at Rome, or at some place of recreation in those parts) euery man may see, whether he had iust cause to be mooued, or no, and to resolute to restraine them at their arriuall (you must vnderstand at Ferrara from whence Fa. Bellarmine, now Card. is said fol. 120. to haue certified Fa. Parsons by his letter of the 17. of October, that the Pope had told him, that if they came to Ferrara, he would cause them to be imprisoned) but much more when after 17. or 18. dayes stay in Rome (as before hath bene said) they could not be induced by the Protectors perswasion, to any quiet course at all. That which was before said, was said fol. 121. which must be one day vn said: for there he affirmeth, that the Card. Caietan, and Burgesius said, and did many things to the Priests, which are most falsly related. For the Cardinal Burgesius entertained them very friendly, and being certified vpon his earnest request (set on by Fa. Parsons, to know it at that time) what was the cause of their coming to Rome, he promised them according to their request, to procure them audience, before they should be iudged, which they did the more earnestly request, for that they had vnderstood by Fa. Parsons (who was then immediatly departed from the Cardinall, but was before certified, that the two priests attended his departure) that his Holines was incensed against them, & nothing els passed betweene the Card. Burgesius and them at that time, and after this they went to the Card. Caietan so soone as they could, after that they vnderstood of his returne to the citie, and he was also very importunate, to know the cause of their coming to Rome, which when they discouered, hee seemed to be much troubled, especially when they talked of the *Subordination*, as his fact: yet concluded thus with them, that they should bring in writing what they had to say concerning the *Subordination*, & the appurtenances to which they accorded, offering to haue the matter (as belonging properly to him) ordered by him (if so it could be)



without troubling his Holines therewith, and requesting his furtherance in such other matters, as were onely in his Holines to graunt; And thus they departed with resolution to returne to the Card. with their difficulties in writing, and agreed with one, who should haue written for them the copy which they were to present to the Card. but they were intercepted by the *Iesuits and Sbirri*, of which *F. Parsons* was the chiefe leader. And this was al which passed betweene the Card. *Caietan* and them, as the Card. well knoweth, and this was vpon the feast day of *S. Thomas* the Apostle, when the waters had begun to rise in *Tiber*, which ouerflowed the citie, and vpon *S. Thomas* of *Canterbury* his day, about the first or second houre in the night, the two priests were caried away to prison, perchance for the solemnising of that feast in some reformed godly maner.

This Authour hauing shewed (to such as must not see) how that the Pope resolved to imprison the two Priests vpon the letters here cited: now he will perswade (such as must beleue) that it was not possible, that *Fa. Parsons* could be the cause of their imprisonment. *It may be seene also* (sayth he) *how vniustly they doe calumniate, and accuse Fa. Parsons, as the cause of all their trouble, considering those letters were written from Flanders, vpon the two messengers first comming ouer, so as Fa Parsons had neither time to procure those letters from Flanders, neither is it likely, that men so graue, learned, and wise (as these are) would be induced by another mans request, to write such letters vnder their owne hands, to so great personages (the Protector, the Generall of the Iesuites, and Fa. Parsons) and that in so important a matter, except they had thought as they wrote, and their iudgements had beene conforme to their letters, and thus much of the first point about their imprisonment.* Are not these effectuall perswasions, that *F. Parsons* could not be the cause of their trouble? suppose all these letters had bene written vpon the first comming ouer of the two priests (as they were not, nor the soonest of them which concerned the two priests, in almost two moneths after) let vs also suppose, that his Holines was induced to resolve vpon the imprisoning these two priests, by these letters which we haue shewed could not be (the soonest of them being written vpon the 25. of *October 1598.* as is confessed in the *Apologie fol. 125.* and his Holines resolved



resolved vpon the 17. of the same moneth before, to imprison them at Ferrara, as is confessed also in the *Apologie fol. 120*) it was so long before their going, and it was so well knowen, that some were to goe, as one of the now busiest Agents tolde one of them for certaine, that whosoever went in that affaire, should at their arriual be cast into prison. And although these Flanders men, who writ, were so perswaded in conscience to write as they did, and did therefore write, because they were so perswaded, this is no prooffe, that they were not induced by others, to haue such a conscience to thinke or to write in that manner, and some of them haue acknowledged, and haue bene and are very sory, that they suffered themselues to be induced by D. Barret to subscribe vnto that letter from Doway. So that this is a poore deuise, and a silly perswasion, that *Fa. Parsons* could not be the cause of the two priests their trouble, who was knowen to haue his Agents in all these partes, if himselfe were ashamed to haue his letters to be seene for any such matter. And it not being prooued out of any of these letters of Flanders, that any of these great personages (*the Cardinal, the Generall of the Iesuites, and Fa. Parsons*) to whom these letters were sent, were perswaded by them that these two Priests were to be imprisoned, before they were heard, the authour leaueth the wound in *Fa Parsons side*, as wide as it was before, vnlesse to heale vp that, he will wound his Holines much deeper, as who (being reputed for a most milde, and wise man) should resolve vpon the imprisonment of a couple of Catholike priests, coming (as it were) bleeding from the campe of Gods Church, to open vnto him such difficulties as were to be redressed, eyther concerning their whole Church, or some members thereof, who had lately challenged vnto them an extraordinary superiority ouer their fellow labourers, without any warrant from him; and to open vnto him what perill might thereby come to the Catholike cause: and offering themselues & their cause with all submission to his Holines, as the effect also prooued (whatsoever this slanderous Libeller suggesteth to his *blind obedient* Reader) But this author sheweth whatsoever he saith that he careth not, if his Holinesse his sides be pierced, so that he may keepe *Fa. Parsons sides* whole. *Now to that which ensueth*  
(saith



(saith this authour) *there is extant a letter, written by F. Parsons to M. Bishop, of the ninth of October 1599. containing a certaine briefe capitulation of the principall points, that passed in this action of the messengers restraint in Rome, &c.* To which letter there is answere made in the English booke, where this letter is set downe at large, and the answere is such, as this authour with a lide snarling onely at it, letteth it passe quietly, neither is it a cauilation, but a very material point, that the *notary* (so much talked of in that letter, and in a wicked false letter of the 20. of February 1599. vnder the name of *M. A.* as if *M. Martin Array* had bene the doer of it) was a *Iesuite*, and that he put in and out what *F. Parsons* would haue him, being himselfe the examiner (although the Popes Comissary did twice or thrice shew himselfe in that time) and if euery dayes examination had bene read (as it was not) in the presence of him, who was examined: yet *F. Parsons* might cause somewhat to be written otherwise then the prisoner did deliuer it, and to haue some things blotted out againe, when the prisoners answere was contrary to his former information, giuen by him, either to his Holinesse or others; neither was euery daies examination subscribed the same day for the prisoner neuer set his hand, but to the last sheete, which was of such impertinent stufte, as it might be added to any examination, and the same hand which writ the examination, being a Iesuits hand, & at the commandement of *F. Parsons* he might (notwithstanding the scoring of the margin, and the after registring (if it were registred) shew what he listed, and if their examinations be extant (as here it is said) then will appeare in some of them many things blotted out, sometime some words, which *F. Parsons* caused to be writ contrary to that which the prisoner deliuered; sometime a whole question, with some part of the answere thereto, when *F. Parsons* could not obtaine of the prisoner to make such answere, as hee would haue him: for remedy whereof *F. Parsons* tooke alwayes afterward this course, that hee would neuer haue his question written downe, vntill hee had heard what answer the prisoner would make, that if the answere were such as he could wrest it to his purpose, then should the question be set downe, and himselfe would for breuities sake frame the answere, about  
which



which there was diuers times some alteration about wordes, which the prisoner vsed not, but was often contented to let F. Parsons haue his will, when the words were such as he knew he could interpret to good sence, notwithstanding his examiners false intention, hoping alwayes, that hee should haue so much fauour, when the matter should grow to an issue. And although that neither all the examination was euer taken, nor that which was taken, let to stand as it was taken, but somewhat was blotted out (as is said) and many answers cut off, vnder pretence sometime of breuitie, sometime that there should be another Interrogatory, to which such an answer would be more fit: the prisoners *subscribed, & swore*, but to what? Not that there was al which was asked, or answered, nor that F. Parsons had not dealt in this kinde, but that those answeres which were there made, were truely & sincerely giuen, which maketh nothing to the clearing of F. Parsons, or the proouing of his honest dealing. And now you shall heare, what matters this author hath picked out of their examinations, and thereby perceiue, what this good fellow would say.

*First then, to talke of substantiall points (sayth this author) the examination of M. Charnocke beginning the 4. of Ianuary, and that of M. Bishop the 10. of Ianuary 1599, and passing ouer all other demaunds, which these men call impertinent, they were asked, what was the cause and reason of their comming to Rome: who sent them, &c. To this M. Charnocke being first examined, answered in these words: Causa aduentus nostri hac fuit, vt rogaremus humillime, &c. The cause of our comming to Rome was this, that we might beseech most humbly, and with all obedience the Sea Apostolicke, that this order appointed by Card. Caietan (for composing controuersies in England, and to make peace) not beeing hitherto confirmed by his Holines (as we vnderstood it is said by diuers priests, and namely Fa. Sicklemore, and others) might be mitigated or changed, or some other order appointed with it for satisfaction of very many priests, who doe thinke (reseruing notwithstanding due honour to the Sea Apostolike) that by this way appointed onely, the strifes begun cannot so well be ended, &c. But if it should please his Holinesse to confirme this authority, and to admit no other, then are these priests content to yeeld all obedience, &c. and as for the Superiour appointed, I spake with the Archpriest before I came forth, and desired him not*



to be offended with me, if I went to Rome about this matter, and hee gaue me leaue to goe to deale for the change thereof. Thus farre the *Apologie*, by which it may appeare, what cause there was of the Priests so long trouble in Rome, their apprehension by *Iesuits*, and *Sbirri*, vpon the feast of *S. Tho. of Canterbury*, the most principall feast of any particular in all our countrey, their keeping so close by the *Iesuites*, as they might not goe out of their seuerall prisons, to heare masse vpon some of the most principall feasts in Gods Church; their being debarred to speake, not onely one of them with the other, but also with any, to aske counsell (except the *Iesuits*,) their being debarred to come to the altar otherwise then lay men, vntill the 7. or 8. of *February*, notwithstanding they had by vertue of a *Iubile* receiued absolution, by the same *Iesuits* from all censures, which it was supposed that either they had, or might haue incurred by this journey to Rome, their continuance in close prison, vntill the 8. of *April* (notwithstanding they had so discharged themselves before the two Card. *Caetan* and *Burghesius*, vpon the 17. of *February* in the English Colledge, as both they themselves and the whole Colledge were tolde, that they should within two or three dayes after, haue their libertie) their being afterwards (although somewhat more easily) imprisoned, the one vntill the 22. of *April*, the other vntill the 6. of *May*: their being banished their country, and confined the one to *France*, the other to *Lorayne*, without any one penny, or pennyworth allowed them, for their maintenance in those places.

By this also it may appeare, how iniuriously they were accused of *schisme*, &c. and with what wickednesse this matter was prosecuted in England against them. but to this deposition, what sayth this author? *Thus he said* (sayth hee) *which how true or probable, or coherent it is to that, which since they haue said, done, and set forth in their bookes, I will leaue to the reader to iudge;* and all the readers could neuer as yet find any particular, more then this author doeth, in which they haue bene contrary thereto: but how doth this answere suite with the rest of this *Apologie*, which referreth the reader to the priests their bookes, to see what he would haue them vnderstand, and yet hath hee taken such order, as no man must read them?

The



The principall matters being then answered by this author in this maner, that the Reader may see, where he is forbidden to looke, he will answere to one point, or two in *M. Charnocks* deposition. The one is where he said, that the Archpriest gaue him leaue to goe, which (saith he) the Archpriest denieth, for that he saw no iust cause. *M. Charnocke* affirmeth it, and can put the Archpriest in minde thereof, and of the cause that mooued him thereto: to wit, when *M. Charnocke* told him, that the matter concerning himselfe in that kinde, it were a necessary point of modestie, to giue leaue: vpon which he was bidden to goe, if he would; Neither doeth the Archpriest his answere to *M. Bishop* here cited, make any thing against this. For there passed some moneths betweene, in which space he might alter his minde by the aduise of his priuie Counsell. Yet this much is here affirmed by *M. Bishop* vnder his oath, that he did not prohibite him: which is an argument, that it was not a thing impossible for him, to bid *M. Charnocke* goe, although no doubt he had rather they should both haue stayed at home.

The second point is, that *M. Charnocke* said: *Quam plures sacerdotes, Very many priests were not satisfied with his Holines order.* Where did *M. Charnocke* affirme this? Is it not possible for this fellow to deale truely in any one thing? Hath not *M. Charnocke* expresly called it *An order appointed by the Cardinall Caietane*, and must we now haue a trick to coulsen the Reader, & make him beleue that *M. Charnocke* should say, that *very many priests were not satisfied with his Holines order*? But let vs see how like he is still vnto himselfe; which speech of *very many priests* (saith he) he doeth explicate afterward, what number it might import in particuler, being pressed thereunto by an Interrogatorie in these words, *Interrogatus, &c.* Being asked, what the number of priests now in England seemed vnto him, he answered, that he could not tell for certaine: but hee thought 300. more or lesse. Then being asked, how many of these he did certainly know to approue this their mission, and to be priuie to the matters that should be proposed, and would stand to those things, that these two should handle, and conclude in their names: He answered, I doe know for certaine 14. or 15, albeit I haue not had conference with them all my selfe. Thus farre the Apologie.

How faine would he play at some game, who stretcheth his



point thus farre? *M. Charnocke* vsed these wordes, *Very many priests*, and *M. Charnocke* declared what he said to be true, by a-  
uouching the letters, which he brought with him: whereof  
some did testifie, that the priests thereabouts residing were of  
such minde; other residing in other places, witnessed as much  
of the priests who passed by them. *M. Bishop* remayning in a  
third place, could testifie for the priests which were neere vnto  
him: and himselfe remayning in a 4. place, could say somewhat  
concerning them that were there resident. And thus was it  
explicated, how he said, *Quamplures sacerdotes, very many priests*.  
But now note, how this author would patch vp some matter.  
*F. Parsons* not being content with this answer, vrged *M. Char-*  
*nocke* as it is here confessed; *how many he did certainly know to*  
*approve this their mission*. To which *M. Charnocke* (as I vnder-  
stand) made this answer: that he would not depose vpon any  
certainty for more then those, with whom he had talked, or had  
some particular message, or notice from them, which were to  
such a number. And this is that mysterie vnfolded, euen by the  
*Apologie* it selfe, how that *very many* might be said to be of such,  
or such disposition, and yet but few to be named, for whom, vp-  
on certaine and proper knowledge, a man may depose; as the  
question is here cōfessed to haue bene asked. And in the same  
sense is *M. Bishops* answer here also acknowledged in these  
words, *Puto me certē scire plus minus 12. I doe thinke, that I*  
*know for certaine 12. priests more or lesse to be of our opinion and pri-*  
*uie to these matters*. And besides this changing of the case to a  
certaine knowledge, it is otherwise also altered. For the questi-  
on was not onely for, *how many doe you certainly know?* but for  
some particulars, which perchance were not necessary for all to  
talke vpon, who notwithstanding might giue their full content  
to haue matters altered from that they now were: and reposed  
atrust, as well in the messengers, as others who were priuie to  
all the circumstances. So that notwithstanding this oath that  
14. or 15. were thus farre forward in the action, there might be  
the better part of the 300. who were said not to be satisfied  
with this order (most falsly and fraudulently suggested here, to  
haue bene knowen to be his Holinesse order) appointed by  
*Cardinal Caietan*, as *M. Charnockes* words are a little before ac-  
know-



knowned *fol 129.* But yet there is an other prooffe of the small number of contradictors: and what is that? Mary sir, *M. Charnocke* confessed that the first to his knowledge, who the Archpr. called to conferre his new authoritie withall, was *M. Collington* and himselfe, which answer is here both falsly and fraudulently said to have bene made to this interrogatory, who were the first beginners, abettors, and setters on in this contradiction against the Cardinals letters. It is very true that *F. Parsons* would sometimes vse these words: and the bauble that euery one of the blinde obedient are still playing withall, the faction. But against these did *M. Charnocke* alwayes except: and *F. Parsons* was to change his lewd termes before answer would be made. But how doeth this proue any thing to this authors purpose? Would he haue his Reader to thinke, that a matter first proposed privately at the courtesie of the proposer (for his letters were to him in priuate, and not to the priests) to such as he should picke out for his purpose (suppose it were the most wicked thing that could be deuised) should displease, or could be contradicted by more, then were called, or sooner then by the first that heard it? The marginall note I take as his cognizance to know him, and his fellowes: *The first beginners* (saith he in the margent) *of this sedition* *M. Collington*, and *M. Charnocke* by his owne confession. He might better haue made this note in the margent, *The first finders out of this most wicked, and seditious plot of the Iesuits, M. Collington, &c.* They (as is said) were first called, and in post haste they were sent for, and *M. Heburne* to giue their liking. And we (saith the *Apologie* repeating *M. Charnocks* answer) hauing read the Card. Protectors letters, began to doubt not so much of the authoritie it selfe (that is, that the Cardinall had appointed such a thing: for so doeth this *Apologie* confesse *fol 129.* that *M. Charnocke* acknowledged this order, to haue bene appointed by Card. *Caietane*, neither do *M. Charnocke* his letters of the 20 of *February* cited, and abused by these fellowes, proue that after he thought any other, then that it was the Cardinals doing: Notwithstanding that the Iesuits laboured to haue him write, that it was the Popes order, and would sometime make bold with this, where the law was in their owne hands) as of the good manner of procuring it. They perceiued that it was got by surrep-



tiō, which is a sufficient cause to except against it: wherby also it may appeare, how ignorantly this fellow cumbreth his margēt, where he hath made this note, *Ergo not doubting you are bound to obey.* For first M. Charn. doth not say, that they had no doubt of the authoritie it selfe; but *that they doubted not so much of the authoritie it selfe, as of the good manner of procuring it.* For they saw it evidently, that it was an ordinance of the Cardinall vnder his hand and seale, though in a priuate letter to M. Blackwell, and his words were plaine: *Dum hac nostra ordinatio durauerit: so long as this ordinance shall endure.* Yet knowing how this Cardinall was caried in our English affaires by the Iesuites, it was neither fellony nor treason, to thinke hee might stretch himselfe to pleasure them. And if the matters had bene handled with any indifferencie, doubtles neither these two, nor any other would euer haue called the matter in question: but there being a notorious partiality descryed in this order, and such as might be the ouerthrowe of our afflicted Church in England, the Priests had reason to make some stop at the first discouery thereof, as iustly they might haue done, although they had not doubted at al, but that it was ordained by his Holines appoint-ment, or by his Holinesse letters, there being sufficient cause to perswade them, that it was gotten by surreption, which doth vitiate or make voyde his Holinesse letters: as M. Collington proueth evidently in his first reason: and consequently the priests were not bound to obey it: and the lesse for that they prepared themselves to goe to Rome to deale with his Holinesse thereabout; and in such manner as is set downe and acknowledged in this *Apologie fol. 129.* out of M. Charnockes examination. And the partiality which was vrged by M. Charnocke, as iustly feared by M. Blackwell, is declared euery where by the priests to be this: that the Iesuites who were the chiefe head of sedition and faction in England against the priests, were now become their iudges and executioners in the shape of a Secular priest, and no way subiect to any order, which was pretended to haue bene taken for peace betweene them & the priests: and these to their iudgments seemed serious and graue causes, not to yeeld themselves at the beginning: which their not yeelding this authour rearmeth *an opposition.* Here we see (saith he)

*how*



*how serious and graue the causes were of this opposition at the beginning: and how at the first they did not doubt of the authoritie it selfe, nor of the Popes will therein, as after they haue pretended. Where is this scene? or where is any mention of any such perswasion, that the Popes will was knowen therein, or that the priests did not doubt thereof? This fellow must needs borrow leaue now and then to play with his blind obedient, and make them beleeue that they doe see that, which himselfe doth not, nor can see: for in this answere of M. Charnocke, there is nothing concerning the Pope, but onely the Cardinall *Protectors* letters, by which the authoritie was instituted by him, and might haue bene thought to haue bene authentically done (if he had any Commission from his Holinesse) or not authentically done (if he had none) so that no Commission appearing, the priests might iustly doubt thereof, although not so much as of the other, to wit, *the manner of procuring it*, which they might perceiue was by surreption. And for this cause M. Charnocke sayd not, that they doubted not at all at the first of the authority it selfe, nor of the Popes will therein, as this authour doth most falsely suggest, but this onely, *we hauing read the Cardinals Protectors letters began to doubt, not so much of the authority it selfe, as of the good manner of procuring it*, as in the same page this authour himselfe setteth downe M. Charnockes answere. But yet note another slippery part of this fellow. He citeth M. Charnockes answere concerning what was done the first day, that the authority was made knowen vnto them, in which you see how he abuseth his Reader, in proouing thereby the smalnesse of the number of the priests. But he ceaseth not here: for he concludeth in this manner, *We see also, that the Priests could not bee many, nor of great account, that resolved this embassage to Rome.* And good sir, how doe you see this? Forsooth M. Charnocke said, that the chiefe priests that dealt with him and M. Bishop, were M. Collington, M. Cope, M. Iohnson, M. Monford, and others; and could not many be included in that word *others*, nor men of great account? if these that were named, were of no great account, were not this apparantly an odious maner of writing? I could retort the phrase, and shew that some of these that are named, and others not named yet, comprehended in this word *others*, were*



were such as for their merit, and labours in Gods Church can hardly be matched by all the faction which is against them: but we will leaue this fellow tumbling in his owne dirt, and pleasing himselfe in his folly, howsoeuer he displeaseth men of iudgement, who haue often difficulties, whether they may better lament him (who by this continuance therein giueth an earnest peny, that others lamentations will nothing profite him) or laugh at him (whose folly is without measure, and still proceedeth from folly to folly.) But now that he hath properly let his Reader see that they could not be *many* nor of *great account*, that resolved of the embassage to Rome, he will prooue, that the *mission and commission was not authenticall*, because M. Bishop, who was one of them that were sent, affirmed that *hee did not know, who was the first authour of this mission, nor why they two were chosen aboue the rest for this mission*: As though a matter might not be as lawfully taken in hand by one, who knoweth not who first did motion it, or why he was requested to it, rather then another, as by one who knoweth both the first moti-  
 oner, and why he was imployed, yet his Reader must hereby perceiue, what authenticall mission, and commission it was, and yet is there much bad dealing in the relation of M. Bishops answere, as appeareth in a treatise ioyned to M. D. Ely his notes vpon the *Apologie*, fol. 13 But yet further (saith he) to say a word or two of the very chiefe point of their commission, and cause of comming to Rome, you haue heard, that M. Charnocke saith, and sweareth before, that their onely comming was to supplicate most humbly to the sea Apostolike, &c. he hath made his blind reader belecue, that hee hath seene, and perceiued; now his Reader must in like sort belecue, that he hath heard; what? M. Charnocke say and sweare that their onely comming was to supplicate, &c. if his readers memory will serue him so farre, as to remember what he hath lately read, concerning this point, or turne backe some two or three leaues, he shal finde this word *onely* foysted in by this authour, to make his Reader belecue in the next page, fol. 133 that M. Bishop and M. Charnocke did scarce seeme agreed in the causes of their comming to Rome.

After this boldnesse, to abuse his reader for his purpose, he sayth a word or two of the very chiefe point of their Commis-  
 sion



lion & cause of comming to Rome, which he thus abridgeth, to supplicate most humbly to the Sea Apostolike, that if the foresayd order of the Archpriests authoritie, were not yet confirmed by his Holinesse, as they had heard Fa. Sicklemore, and some others had reported, that then the same might be either mitigated, or changed, or some other order appointed together with it. Thus hath hee layed downe the priests their plaine song; now marke what descant he hath made thereon: so as now (sayth he) our brethren seemed not to doubt of the trueth or value of the Cardinals letters, nor were not yet growen to be so bold, as to affirme that his Holines could not do it without their consents, except he violated the Canons; nor that it was a forreine Iurisdiction subiect to treason, and Premunire, if it were acknowledged: and other such like deuises.

Our brethren neuer grew to any such boldnes (as he termeth it) as to affirme any thing of *Treason*, or *Premunire*, but onely shewed, that they had iust cause to forbear to admit the authoritie, both in regard that by the opinions of diuers men of Iudgement in the lawes of our countrey, this our case may and will be drawen within the Compase of an olde lawe, &c. viz. the law of *Premunire*, as it is set downe in the English booke pag. 6. where also is shewed, that by the accepting hereof the priests might be taken, for to comply with the chiefe authors thereof in al such state matters, as were practised by them. And these were rather causes for them, why they were not ouerhastie to admit of this authority, then arguments vrged against it: And yet neither of these causes haue or can be proued insufficient. And for more prooffe, that these causes were not giuen in any other sort, the priests did submit themselues, when they did see his Holinesse letters in confirmation thereof. But now let vs heare the first part of this mans descant. So as now (saith he) our brethren seemed not to doubt of the trueth, or value of the Cardinals letters, nor were not yet growen to be so bold, as to affirme, that his Holinesse could not doe it without their consents, except hee violated the canons. How doth this fellow vpon M. Charnockes answere gather this? If there were no doubt of the trueth, and value of the Cardinals letters, why is it here sayd, that M. Charnocke put this doubt, if the foresayd order of the Archpriests authoritie were not yet confirmed by his Holinesse? Did this speech



imply a doubt or no? if it did, how boldly doth this fellow descant vpon a doubt, and say that it was no doubt? if it did not imply a doubt, let him tell vs, how a man may more properly make a doubt, then by this word *if*? Perchance he may meane, that the priests did not doubt, but that those letters were the Cardinals letters, and then he sayth well: but he doth not descant right: for the question was, whether that the Card. letters had receiued any force by his Hol. confirmation, as may appeare by that, which is here by himselfe set downe: and whereas hee sayth, that *the priests were not so bolde, as to affirme at that time, that his Holinesse could not doe it without their consents, except hee violated the canons*, the priests were bold to affirme (with humilitie, and reuerence to the Sea Apostolike) as much. But howe doth he proue, that *they were not yet growne to that boldnesse*? Forsooth because no such matter was set downe in this point of M. Charnocks answer; as though euery thing must of necessity be set downe, which the priests had to say, or could say. but this is perchance an idle shift & now deuised by the priests, and coyned for the purpose: Listen then to that, which is set downe by this author in the *Epistle* to his Holinesse past the middle thereof: *Yet a fewe not the twentieth part of our English Clergie, and presumed to impugne the same, (the Subordination) calling first in question the sayd Cardinals letters, their trueth, faith, and integritie, the indifferencie of his person in iudgement, and affection. Then also your Holinesse meaning, yea your authority it selfe, whether you could doe it without them or no, (the canons of Holy Church obserued) with other like vnseemly oppositions for prosecution whereof they sent two of their company to Rome.* But this was forgotten when the author of the *Apologie* came to this Chapter. Furthermore it was obiected against the two priests at Rome, that they had there giuen out, that they doubted whether his Holinesse could appoint them a Superiour without their priuite and consent (obseruing the lawes of holy Church) as may appeare by the libell Master Doctor Haddocke, and Master Martine Aray deliuered vp to his Holines (as was sayd) 10. January 1599: for there in the second Article. are these words: *Ipsi verò nihil credere, nec acquiescere, sed hasitare ad omnia, non admittere auctoritatem, vocare in dubium an vera essent, qualiteris illis*



*illis continebantur; Sanctissimi iuſſu hanc eſſe conſtitutam, & ſi verum id erat, dubitare tamen, an pontifex facere poſſit, ut ipsis in- conſultis, ac inuitis, ſuperiorem ijs coſtituerit, quod poſtea etiam quum Romam appulerunt dicere, ac ſapius etiam repetere non ſunt veriti, ut per teſtes idoneos probare poſſumus. That is, but they (ſpeaking of M. Collington and M. Charnocke) when the Archpriest firſt ſent for them, would beleue nothing nor obey, but did ſticke at all things: they would not admit the authoritie: they called it in doubt, whether thoſe things were true, which were contained in theſe letters (of the Cardinals) namely, that the authoritie was conſtituted by his Hol. commandement: and if it were ſo, yet they doubted, whether his Hol. could appoint them a Superiour, unwitting, and unwilling thereto: which afterward they feared not to ſay, when they came to Rome, yea and repeated it often, as we can proue by conuenient wit- neſſes. And yet would this fellow perſwade his reader, that the prieſts did firſt contradiſt, or oppoſe themſelues againſt the authority, and then afterwards finde ſome reaſons for it, yea after the two prieſts were gone to Rome, notwithstanding theſe plaine teſtimonies of his owne, that the prieſts had theſe difficulties at the beginning. But perchance M. Charnockes an- ſwere put all theſe things out of his memorie: & non putarat, he thought not vpon it. How ſo? Forſooth M. Charnocke ſaid, that the cauſe of his comming was to ſupplicate moſt humbly to the Sea Apoſtolike, that if the aforeſayd order of the Archpriests autho- ritie were not yet confirmed by his Holineſſe, as they had heard that Fa. Sicklemore, and ſome other had reported, that then the ſame might be either mitigated, or changed, or ſome other order appointed with it, thus he collecteth M. Charnocks anſwere: and thereup- on commeth with a, ſo as now our brethren ſeemed not to doubt &c. nor were yet growne to be ſo bold, as to affirme that his holineſſe could not doe it without their conſents, except he violated the canons, &c. The humble ſpirit of the prieſts (who hauing many and moſt iuſt cauſes to deale in other maner then by way of ſup- plication) being meaſured by his own proud humor of wrang- ling where he had no iuſt cauſe, brought him into this error. Next follow the reaſons or cauſes, which mooued M. Biſhop to come to Rome, which were fixe, and hee here ſetteth them downe, and proueth that he, and M. Charnocke did ſcarce ſeem*



to agree in the causes of their comming. And how so? Forsooth M. Charnocke sayd, and sware, *that his onely comming* was to supplicate &c. fol 132. But whosoever will turne to M. Charnocks oath set downe fol 129. shal find this iugler, and how that this word *onely* is here foisted in by him for this purpose.

*And so much* (sayth he) *of this, for that it were overlong to run over all points* (and not finde one for his purpose, without a litle of his arte, which will serue him no longer, then vntill it cometh into the aire; for then all this painting and false colours will easily be descried, and himselfe worthily laughed at, for his so grosse counterfeiting: ) *yet thus in brieft they affirmed both of them, that as for the Archpriest, they brought nothing lawfully prooued against him, either in learning, life, or manners: and the like they affirmed of the Iesuits.* An euident argument euen to F. Parsons and the rest, that they went to Rome, to deale in peaceable manner with his Holines concerning these matters; beeing able to bring more matters vnder the hands of sufficient witnesses, then the Archpriest will be euer able to answere, and which in any court of Iustice would haue hindered his confirmation. But this authour setteth downe his matters somewhat warily: the priests brought nothing against the Archpr. *lawfully prooued* (as for the Iesuits, let any indifferent man iudge, whether the priests were in place to haue medled with them further, then that the Iesuits were their *laylours*) somewhat be-like they could haue said, but they brought nothing *lawfully prooued*: M. Bishop (sayth he) *said he heard his fellow Rob. say, that M. Collington and himselfe had heard the Archpriest utter an hereticall proposition: which was, that they could not appeale from him to Rome.* They both affirme, that hee stood very peremptorily in it, after that hee was warned thereof: and if M. Bishop did affirme, that this proposition was *hereticall*, or the author of the *Apologie* doe thinke so of it himselfe, I wonder that M. Bishops fellow Rob. was not asked the question, his examination not being ended in some 6. or 7. dayes after that M. Bishop was dispatched, as appeareth here, fol. 134. and this is one speciall matter which this author chuse out of many, *ouer which it had beene overlong to runne ouer.* Will ye heare another *in brieft*, as he sayth? M. Charnocke beeing asked, what money they had, made



made answere, for 30. crownes more then M. Bishop tooke notice of: which perchance this author here inserted, that his reader might give credit to M. Bishop, when he said, as is extant in the English booke, pa. 171. *The examinations were: what is your name: how olde: where remained you in England: how and which way came you ouer: what money brought you ouer with you, &c. and much such like impertinent stuffe to fill up the papers, that when wee came to the matter it selfe, they might be briefe, taking barely what we came about, without the reasons & perswasions of it: yea obiecting against it, and peruerting it what they could.*

The third principal point which (notwithstanding the haste) was in no case to be ouerslipped, but rather run ouer, is a disagreement betweene M. Bishop and M. Charnocke about one point of their commission. And thus forgetting how he had before foisted in this worde *onely* to make a disagreement betweene them, in that the one should say, *that their onely comming was to supplicate, &c. fol 132.* and the other alledge *sixe causes* of his comming: Now hee is contented, that M. Charnocke should say, that he had *diuers points in commission*: and how commeth this kindnesse ouer him? forsooth he would faine find another disagreement betwixt M. Bishop and M. Charnocke, and for this purpose, hee must intreat his reader to forget, that he had before made him beleue, how that he had heard, that M. Charnocke said and sware, that *their onely comming was to supplicate, &c.* and now that it will please him to vnderstand, that Master Charnocke said, *that he had in commission amongst other points for to procure, that no bookes should be hereafter written by Catholics, that might exasperate the state of England.* M. Bishop said, *that he liked not that commission, but rather it should be left as hitherto, to the discretion of the writers: adding further, that in his opinion such bookes, as before had bene written, had rather done good then hurt.* M. Doctor Ely hath noted vpon the Apologie, that the author thereof is much troubled with the chincough: which in his relating this point, may be very easily scene, by his leauing out of certaine wordes at the end of the point, auouched by M. Charnocke to haue bene in his commission. The wordes are these, *sine necessitate aut utilitate: without need or profit*: which wordes being added vnto the point (as he calleth it in M. Char-



*nocks* commission, or the petition of the priests, as they termed it) maketh the matter so iust a request, as no man of sense can dislike thereof. But the very thing indeed which troubled this author was, that *F. Parsons* vrging very much to know, whether that the *booke of succession* were not one of these, which were within the compasse of this petition, was told directly by *M. Charnocke*, that it was, and thereupon grew a little alteration betweene them (to fill vp the papers perchance, as *M. Bishop* sayth) and as for *M. Do. Bishop* it is so plainely set downe what hee answered concerning this *booke of succession*, or *titles*, in the answer for *M. Doct. Bishop*, fol. 16. (which answer is annexed to *M. Doct. Ely* his notes vpon the *Apologie*) that I cannot but wonder at this fellowes greedinesse to forge matters, to make some shew at the least, that *M. Doctor Bishop* and *M. Charnocke* disagreed. For first, *M. Doct. Bishop* was not asked any question concerning this point, as there it is affirmed, but had some priuate talke concerning the *bookes of titles*. And the effect of his answer is, that the booke is so penned, as that while many by warrant thereof may iustly striue for the crowne, a stranger may come in, and take it from them all: and how this agreeth to that which the *Apologie* sayth, of a difference betwixt *Master D. Bishop* and *M. Charnocke*, an indifferent reader will quickly iudge.

Now followeth a contemptible repetition of tickets and scrolles, the least whereof was bigger, then any by which this *subordination* was requested (vnlesse wee should say, as the author of the *Apologie* would perswade vs, cap. 8 fol. 98. & 104. that the 7. of *March* endured at Rome vntill many moneths passed in other countreys) and many of them were directed to his Holines as humble supplications, to which according to the old fashion men did not vse to set any seale, but their names onely: and so were these subscribed in the best manner, that the writers could, and the papers were of purpose so small, for the better conueyance of them, if the bearers should haue chanced to haue beene searched (as this authors wit might haue taught him) and not onely the names were to the petitions, but the matters which were demanded: by which these foolish doubts here made, are easily solued: *what manner of commission these*  
men



*men had, or could haue? from whome? by what meanes? for what matters? & whether they in England would stand to all points which these men here should conclude in their behalfe? and whether these mens authoritie were generall, or limited? For by these letters it was seene, that they had such commission as many could giue, where there was no one in authoritie; the Archpriest not being as yet confirmed, nor (if hee had any) likely to haue giuen any commission to any, whome he should imagine liked not of such his preferment. It was also seene, from whome they had the commission, for that the priests names were to their petitions. The meanes likewise were faire, without threatnings of execution and such like, as were vsed to make the priests subscribe to the Archpriest. The matters also were specified in their petitions, and the priests in England committing their matters to these two, there needed no great doubt to haue bene made, whether they would haue stood to that, to which they had agreed in that behalfe, as they did, when (receiuing the Breue signed by their two handes, of which otherwise perchance there might haue bene some doubt, vnlesse the originall had bene sent) they all submitted themselves. It was also euident by the points set downe in particular, what they had to deale in, in the names of the rest, although they were not thereby debarred any way, to deale as they saw cause, or had hope to effect any good for their countrey. So that his endlesse folly might haue bene left out, where he concludeth finally that the priests did onely agree in contradicting, and pulling downe, but nothing that was probable or facible for setting vp, and so their examinations were ended &c. A very good conclusion, and well deducted out of his principles.*

*All this being done (saith he) and the whole processe considered, and weighed well by the Cardinals, and after related to his Holines: it was resolved, that the said Cardinals, with his Holines Commissary Acarisius, should goe to the Colledge themselves, and to see whether they had any thing els to say, or write. Who doeth not now prepare himselfe to heare some matter to some purpose? For all which hitherto hath bene touched in the Apologie, seeme to be but *praludia*, or an entrance to this acte. Here was it to be tried how iustly, or iniustly the priests had done, and to be shewed,*  
how



how worthily they had bene imprisoned with infamy, kept close so long, debarred al helpe, one of the other. Here was the proper place for this author to haue answered the English booke, which was one of the two for which this *Apologie* was written (this apparance of the two priests before the Cardinals being set downe so particularly in the English booke intituled *The copies of the discourses pag 95.96.97.98.*) But alack the good man had not what to say, but that which would haue cleared the priests, nor was able to controll any part of the narration, which is made in the places cited, but turneth off his reader with certaine generall termes, to which he first disposeth him with as idle discourtes, First taking occasion to exclaime vpon D *Bagshaw*, for that he thought it requisite, that the *Archpresbytership* should be recalled, as being neither requested by vs, nor any way profitable: and that some Hierarchie were instituted, which were to be approued by the free suffrages of the priests onely of the *Seminaries*. And for this this author exclaimeth, *Loe what a resolute lawmaker here is, who recalleth the Popes Subordinations in a word, & setteth vp another of his owne making with as great facilitie.* Loe what a resolute ly-maker here is, who affirmeth that which is most false, and can no way follow of the doctors words. For the *Archpresbytership* was not the Popes *Subordination*, but the Cardinals, as then it was manifest by the Cardinals letters, where he said, *Dum hac nostra ordinatio durauerit, so long as this our ordinance shall endure.* Neither doeth the Cardinal in any place of those letters affirme (as this resolute ly-maker doeth often inculcate in this *Apologie*) that he did it *expresso mandato Sanctissimi*, By expresse commandement of his Holines. Neither doeth the doctor recall it, but signifie vnto such as were going to Rome, what his and others opinion was of the vnprofitableness thereof. And being thrust vpon them vnasked, that it was to be recalled by his Holines, in whom the author (as I trow) will acknowledge a power to doe as much as this was.

Loe likewise what a resolute lye-maker here is, who affirmeth that the doctor setteth vp another *Subordination* of his owne making with as great facilitie, whereas the doctor writeth in the same kinde to haue some other by his Holines appointment, of which he desireth not, that himselfe should be the setter



ter vp, but the priests whom it shall concerne, which was according both to the Cannons of holy Church, and his Holines meaning, as diuers priests can witnes, the Pope hauing alwayes borne that speciall fauour vnto the priests. But what else was discovered in those papers of the doctors? Forsooth *the changing of the gouernment of the Seminaries, especially that in Rome, yea the change of the Protector himselfe.* Very true, For that the vnquietnes which the Iesuits made in Rome among the students, was a great cause of the vnquietnes here in England; And seeing that there was no hope of any quiet so long as the Iesuits had the gouernment, what euil request was it to haue them removed thence? Neither was the request of the doctor, and some others ioyned with him, for the change of the *Protector* absolutely: but that there might be some other, or some ioyned with him in regard he was knowen to be one, who in the Iesuits quarels tooke part alwayes very partially with them against the students, and the students appeale from him, or their declining from his iudgement had bene in former times admitted by his Holines, who now is.

And further it was ~~discovered~~ *discovered by the same papers (saith he) and other letters out of England, that they had particular designments, to make themselues Bishops and Archbishops.* And how was this discovered, or what prooffe hath this authour of this? *whereupon (saith he) in some letters it was written, To your L L.* This is all the prooffe, that those to whom this letter was written, had particular designments to make themselues Bishops and Archbishops. If one should write to Rome to *Fa. Parsons*, and direct his letter in this manner, *To your Grace:* of what could *F. Parsons* be conuinced, others so writing vnto him? But *Fa. Parsons* in his letter of the 9. of October 1599. to M. Bishop, making mention of this iest, is answered in the English booke, pag. 127. and is told, that M. Charnocke hearing thereof at Rome, did there challenge it as a faigned matter. And there it is shewed at large, in what sort it might be forged. And this *Apologie* being made to answer that English booke, letteth all that discourse goe quietly: the authour hauing taken good order that his lewdnesse should not be knowen among these *blind-obedient*: and hath the lesse shame to iterate any falshood without disproouing



uing that which hath bene before directly sayd against it. And a particular discourse being diuulged at this time, under the hand-writing of one of their chiefe followers named M. Watson, was sent to Rome, whilest these men were there: Whereunto was subscribed by another in these words, Sic sentio W. B. By this discourse also this author would prooue, that the priests that went to Rome, went with hope of reward: to wit, to be made Primats themselves; and to make other Bishops of their partners at their returne: yea notwithstanding their oath which they tooke, that they neuer heard of any discourse, this authour emboldeneth himselfe to burden them with it, or at the least with the knowledge thereof. For such are his words, *though these messengers in Rome would not seeme to acknowledge it*, Fa. Parsons told M. Bishop that such a letter he had, and requested to knowe, whether it were not his name, that was subscribed in this manner, *Sic sentio G. B. not W. B.* as here is most falsely suggested, perchance to take away the suspition from such as were the authors thereof for the disgrace of M. Bishop, and M. Charnocke (as M. Bishop toucheth it in his answere to Fa. Parsons, set downe in the English booke, pag. 159) To which demand of Fa. Parsons, M. Bishop made answere, that it was not his name: and that he neuer had heard of the discourse before. Moreouer, hee saide that those letters might stand for Geor. Blackwellus, as well as Guliel. Bishop. By which it is euident, that this author dealeth falsely in setting down the letters W. B. For who is so foolish, as to think, that M. Bishop would plead, that George was spelled with W? This is also particularly set downe in the answere made in the behalfe of M. Bishop, which is annexed vnto M. D. Ely his notes vpon the *Apologie fol. 17.* where also it is affirmed that D. Bishops answere for M. Watson was farre otherwise, then this authour pretendeth: and is therefore challenged to haue no tender conscience in this dealing. But (as it seemeth) this author intended to disgrace M. Watson all that he could: and at the first discrediteth himselfe in obiecing, that M. Watson was a seruant in the English College at Rhemes, as though that were so great a blot (many most worthy men hauing bene of as meane, or meaner condition.) And this being truely considered, maketh more for M. Watsons commendation, that he would liue in so meane



meane estate out of his countrey for the cause he did. And if this *common wealth*, here by a foolish digression inserted, (being a matter as *Fa. Parsons* tooke vpon his conscience before the Cardinals, to which the two priests were neuer priuy) were of *M. Watsons* making, as he doth vtterly deny it: as also that either hee sent any such to Rome, or was priue to the sending thereof, but rather thinketh, as others also, that it was sent by the contrary part to *Fa. Parsons* for some policie: yet he had not bene more idly occupied, then was the plotcaster of *Reformation*, the absurdities whereof, were they yet perchance after so many alterations layd downe, would farre surpasse these of this *common wealth*, which is attributed to *M. Watson*.

This digression being made, and more seriously handled then any material point in this controuersie, this authour falleth againe into the Cardinals comming to the College, together with the Comissary. *And to proceede* (saith he) *more substantially they heard first the aforesaid depositions read*, (that is to say some part of them, as is noted in the English booke, pa. 95) *as also the procurators of the Archpriest, what they could say or demand, who bringing forth the foresaid letters of the most graue of our Nation* (that is to say, the letters of D. Barret, subscribed by D. Webbe, D. Worthington, and D. Kellyson: and also the letters of M. Wright, the Deane of Cortrac: all which, and onely these were inserted into a Libell, which these Proctors for the Archpriest put vp to the two Cardinals against M. Bishop, & M. Charnocke) *against this new sedition begun, made supplication that some effectuell remedy might be put thereunto*. Very well, good sir, thus much is confessed in the English booke, pag. 96. that M. D. Haddocke, and M. Martin Array deliuered vp in a dumbe shewe a Libell, or bill of complaints, or accusations against M. Bishop and M. Charnocke. But what answere made those priests vnto that bill? *The messengers also were heard what they could say, or answere*. But now in a little honesty what said they? or what answere did they make to these matters? Is it not possible, that any thing did passe woorth the relating? was all this preparation fetched from *Iohn of Gaunt* for no greater satisfaction, then to say, when it commeth to the chiefe point: *that the messengers were heard, what they could say, or answere?* If there hath beene



found so much waste paper in this *Apologie*, for to entertaine by-tales, and nothing to the purpose, could there not be some spared, for the setting downe of so necessary a point, as this is, and such as was most likely to haue benefited a iust cause, more then twentie tales of *Iohn of Gaunt*? would not a discourse of what passed betweene the Cardinals, and the two priests with the Proctors, haue bene more gratefull to the reader, after that the Cardinals comming to the College was mentioned, then a relation of *M. Watsons common wealth*? In the English booke to which this *Apologie* pretendeth to answere, it is set downe pag. 97 and 98. that the messengers were not heard, what they could say or answere, and it is not set downe in general termes, but particularly, in what sort they were not admitted, to say what they would, or to answere: to wit, that the Libell being read, the priests requested, that the Proctors might be put to their othes, that no falshood was contained therein: and the Cardinall *Caietane* answered for the Proctors himselfe, that it was not needfull, and furthermore affirming (for the poore dumbe men who as yet had not discovered themselues, whether they could speake or no) *that they should prooue what was denied*: the whole Libell was denyed, and a copy therof demanded, that answere might be made vnto it. This was it that the messengers did say, and the Iesuites gaue this for one cause afterwards, why the two priests were not set at libertie the same day, that *M. Bishop* had shewed too much earnestnesse in this very point, for which he was to be kept close some two or three dayes more, and *M. Charnocke* likewise: but yet for no other cause, then that it was not conuenient, that he should be at libertie, vntill the other had satisfied by a longer imprisonment, for his quicknesse of spirit, in demanding the Libell to answere it. But the Proctors hauing before their lesson, what they were to say, or doe, as it should seeme, the one of them stepped presently (without making his fellow acquainted therewith at that instant) betweene *M. Bishop*, and the table, whereat the Cardinall sate: and made humble request, that the copie of this libell might not bee deliuered vnto the priests, but rather that a peaceable conclusion might be made. Of which the Cardinall taking present hold pursued that motion, and would not deliuer  
the



the Libell to the two messengers ( whereby it is euident, that this authour followeth his old trade in this place, where he affirmeth, *that the two messengers also were heard, what they could say, or answere* ) but shewed a good face to the priests, and vsed them so friendly as they expected not to returne to their prisons, especially being cleared from all matters by the Cardinals, excepting this onely, that many were scandalized in England at their iourney to Rome: which was a thing, that they could not helpe, nor were iustly to be blamed therefore: yet notwithstanding thinking it fit, to keepe the Cardinall in that good and friendly humour, the two priests made this answere: that if by their iourney to Rome, they had giuen cause of scandall to any, they were very sory for it, and were ready to giue satisfaction, and so were dismissed, and all was well vntill the Cardinall *Burghese* was departed. But soone after his departure, the Iesuite, who for this time had supplied *F. Parsons* (the head Iaylors) place, locked them vp againe in their seuerall prisons, but for two or three daies, as was pretended vpon the foresayd cause: & for that *M. Bishop* by his silence when he was bidden to speak, after his examinatio<sup>n</sup> read, did discontent the Card. somewhat. This author hauing told his reader of the cōming of the Cardinals to the Colledge, and of the Proctors demand of remedy against the new sedition: also how that the messengers were heard say what they could (which as it is said is most false) he concludeth this matter as if some great acte had bene made, and the Proctors had had some great day against the Priests. And finally (sayth he) *after diuers graue speeches vsed by the Cardinals against this diuision in our nation, they departed, promising (perchance to F. Parsons) to relate all vnto his Holines, and to take his resolution for the finall sentence, which they sent afterward sealed and signed by their owne hands, and seuerall seales, bearing date the 8. of April 1599.* (vpon which day in the morning the two priests their close imprisonmēt first ceased) *In which sentence for that diuers things were inserted in the narration, which might seem grienous, (which were perchance according to F. Parsons informations, but not to be known abroad, lest his doings should haue ben known) & the decree it self, which is yet extant to be seen, appeared somewhat seuer,* (against men who were not suffered to



make their answer) *Fa. Parsons as we understand* (to the perpetuall discredite of the Cardinals (howsoever the infamie would haue beene wiped away from his Holinesse, if it were true which here is said, that the Cardinals tooke his Holinesse resolution for this finall sentence) *procured the said sentence to be detained, untill hee had entreated the said Cardinals, to mitigate somewhat that sentence, and to giue another more mild of the 21. of the same moneth, not so much by way of Iudiciall sentence, as of a letter* (to wit, to the Rector, or Vicerector of the English colledge, *F. Parsons or the minister) under their hands and scales, appointing that the said two messengers should returne the one to Paris, and the other to Loraine, as they had requested.* (They both had requested to be in *Paris*, being both to be banished their countrey) but this not being to be granted, request was made for the other to be in *Loraine*, a place that *F. Parsons* dreamed not of, when hee debarred him not onely *Paris*, but all other parts of France, notwithstanding hee vrged that France was bigge enough to hold him and his fellow. And these places are said to be appointed by the letter *Interpretatiuely* (for neither of them are named in the Letter) *but not into England* (he should haue added, *Scotland nor Ireland*, for so runneth the sentence) *without speciall licence of his Holines, or the Protector, under paine of suspension, and other censures, &c.* But wherefore was this sentence giuen? True it is, that the two priests were banished not onely their owne countrey, but Scotland also and Ireland, and confined in other countreys, where they were lesse likely to haue wherewithall to maintaine them, and had not any thing giuen them to keepe them in these strange countreys from begging or staruing: (a bountifull consideration of the Church, for so it must be taken, towards priests who had left their right and possibilitie of all preferments, to serue the Church with continuall and euident perill of their liues; and one of them had suffered imprisonment for the Catholike faith:) *which sentence* (sayth this author) *they accepted, and confirmed also by a corporall oath.* This fellow forgetteth himselfe: This sentence he sayth was by way of a letter (to *F. Parsons*, who was Rector, or to the Vicerector) and by *F. Parsons* onely was this sentence shewed first to *M. Charnocke*, who was yet in prison: then afterwards to *M.*  
*Bishop,*



*Bishop*, who was at liberty, and had ben so some certaine dayes. And neither did *F. Parsons* exact any oth of them, neither did they take any vnto him. And in the tenth Chapter, fol. 155. it is vrged, that this oath was exhibited, by *the immediate Commissarie or Delegate of his Holines*, which titles belonged not to *F. Parsons*, to whome this letter was directed by the two Cardinals, as shall hereafter appeare. The truth of this story, and how this letter lay hid (as was pretended) in *F. Parsons* chamber, for certaine dayes (as he told *M. Charnocke*) is set downe in the booke dedicated to the *Inquisition*, pag 88. and it goeth vncontrolled and vntouched, which in the iudgement of any indifferent man it should not, if any iust exceptions could be takē against it. Yet must his Reader be told, that this author proceedeth no otherwise, then in such sort as must satisfie all men: for this he sayth, fol. 126. speaking of himselfe, offering for prooffe either the *publique testimonies of his Holines, the two Cardinals Protectors, Acarissius the Popes Fiscal, and other parties that were actors, or priuie to the cause: or else the depositions of the said messengers themselves, vnder their hands and oaths: or finally the witnesse of the whole English Colledge and nation, that knowe what passed in this matter, which is another manner of proceeding, then to publish things in corners by way of libels, without any further ground of truth, then the will or malice of the publisher.* But these testimonies so much wanted of, are loth to come to light, or are caried into some farre countreys, as disdaining to be in corners, such as *England, Flanders, France, and Italy*: for these were the corners, in which the priests books were published: and in these corners haue the priests iustified their bookes, which this poore fellow calleth *libels*, to shift them off by one meanes or other. And the priests were neuer so daintie of their bookes, but that they who opposed themselues against them, might haue Gods plenty for their comfort: whereas contrarywise this miserable *Apologie*, had a quartane euery time that it came to any of the priests hands: and when it was to be scene by them, it was by stealth, and but for an houre or two, so did it quake, for feare of being found to be such stuffe, as since it hath bene sufficiently discovered. Yet to encourage the *blind-obedient*, it telleth them of *Popes, and Cardinals testimonies, and authentick matters*, and bringeth nothing:



thing which can please these blinde affectioned, but some railing words against Catholike priests, as though if it could perswade the reader, that they were most wicked by often inculcating it vnto him, the cause were wonne: and a railing word of this authors mouth, would be of more weight to determine a controuersie, then all possible right in the part oppressed. But the indifferent reader will weigh his reasons, and not his foule words; and iudge of matters, not as they are said to be, but as they are prooued. And thus much in answere to the ninth Chapter.

### CHAP. 15.

*How this Apologie-maker shuffleth off the true cause of this present controuersie, and layeth the blame thereof vpon the Secular priests. Apol. cap. 10.*

**I**N the tenth chapter of the *Apologie*, the author thereof intendeth to shew, how that all controuersies were ended vpon the publication of his *Holines Breue*: and how that a new breach was made. He promisetht also to handle some excesses of his brethren, and of their dealings with the Counsell. The first point he handleth very slenderly (as it should seeme) for he forgetteth often that euer the controuersies were ended. The second he layeth falsly to the priests as shall be shewed: and in the rest he onely sheweth his merchandize. And thus he beginneth this Chapter.

*After that his Hol. had well considered the little waight of reason, which these two former messengers had brought in the behalfe of their partners in England, for raising so great a sedition against the Protectors letters, and Archpriests incitation, and had giuen some due reprehension to the sayd messengers, as by their restraint, as well in Rome, as by that they were not permitted to returne presently into England, he thought conuenient to confirme the sayd Protectors letters &c.* In these few lines it is to be noted first, how that his Holinesse is sayd to haue restrained the priests (who went to Rome) vpon consideration of *the little waight of reason*, which they brought, and permitted them not to returne, or (as we say  
in



in English) *banished them*, not onely *England*, but *Scotland* also, and *Ireland*, yea and *confined them* to seuerall Countreys, without allowing them any thing for their maintenance. Secondly, how his Holinesse confirmed the Cardinals letters. Touching the first, it is knowen to all the world, or at the least in those parts, which this author calleth *corners*, those are *England*, *Flanders*, *France*, and *Italie*, where their bookes haue been published, or sent, that the two priests were restrained before they deliuered any reasons of their forbearance, to subiect themselves to the Archpriest, and as yet no one part of their relation hath been prooued faulty. They haue layd downe an orderly narration of their messengers disorderly restraint, through the false & wicked suggestiōs of their aduersaries, before that they had any audience, and thereby haue made it euident, that his Holines did not restrain them, vpon any consideration of their reasons, because he heard them not, nor any cause else, before they were restrained. Secondly, it is at large related both in the English booke pag. 97. 98. 104. 105. and els where, as also in the booke to the *Inquisition* pag 77. how that when the priests came to their answer, before the Cardinals *Caietane*, and *Burghese*, they were not suffered to haue a copie of their accusations brought against them, (although it were most earnestly demanded by them) that they might make their answer thereunto, but a dissembling shew was made to haue all matters taken vp in peace and quietnes. And this author not being able to gaine say any of this: how shamelesly doth he here tell his reader, that *his Holinesse had well considered the little weight of their reasons*: and had therefore not onely restrained them, but *banished them*, or (as he tearmeth it) not permitted them to returne presently into *England*? And although it be true which this author affirmeth, that his Holines confirmed the Card. letters: yet it is euident, that he did not vpon consideration of *the little weight* of the messengers *their reasons*: for they were neuer suffred to deliuer them, as the custome of God Church was, where a matter is instituted, and some doe offer themselves (to those to whō it belongeth) to shew what they haue to say in it, before it be established. Neither hath this author shewed, or can without a trick of his accustomed fals-



hood say, that the two priests euer appeared in this action before any other, then those two Cardinals, vpon the 17. of February 1599. or that they did not at that time make request, to haue the copie of the *Libel*, to make their answer vnto it. And as for their examinations, who is so simple, as to build any matter thereon, as though that were a place, or time conuenient for them to deale in the charge committed vnto them, being both asunder, and priuatly talked with, or examined by their professed enemies? The time, and place of triall was before the appointed Iudges: when, and where this author must shewe, that they did not offer to make their answer to whatsoener was obiected against them: and namely to that absurd *Libel*, which M. D. *Haddock*, and M. *Martin Array* put vp against them concerning a *sedition* (as the *Libel* tearmeth it) supposed to haue bene raised in England by them, and their fellowes, by not admitting the authority vpon the sight of the Cardinals letters. Here was this author to haue shewed a defect of the messengers their reasons, and not to haue ouerslipped these particulars, which passed in this time and place, being the sole time and place, in which the two messengers met, & might haue shewed their reasons, if they might haue been heard. But this author his fairest game is to slubber vp al material points, and to beare his reader in hand in generall tearmes, with testimonies of *Popes* and *Cardinals*; which indeed he bringeth some time, but not at all for the matter, in which he ought to bring his testimony, or to controll any thing, which is set downe by the priest. And so doth he bring here an *authentick testimony*, that his Holines confirmed the Cardinals letters. But he prooueth not thereby that the priests restraint and banishment were iust. But let vs examine this testimony, which is here brought: and wee shall finde a notorious falsifying of the Popes letters.

*He (the Pope) thought conuenient, to confirme the sayd Protectors letters, and euery part and parcel thereof, with a new Breue, dated the sixt of April 1599. Affirming: omnia, & singula de expresso mandato, & ordine, & cum participatione, & certa scientia nostris, facta, & ordinata fuisse, & esse. That all and euery thing contained in the same letters were done and ordayned by his Holinesse expresse commandement and order, and by his certaine knowledge,*



ledge, and participation. All this is truly related out of the *Breue*. And had he here made a stop, he might haue been accounted an idle fellow, to cite a matter, of which not one word proued anything at all, that the little waight of their reasons, was a cause of the priests *restraint* in Rome, *confinement* in strange Countreys, or *confirmation* of the authoritie. But he will goe a little further; and because if he had cited the *Latine*, he should haue discovered his falshood, he maketh a stop thereat, and goeth forward with an English translation of the *Breue* in this manner: *And therefore to haue been and to bee firme, and in force and of most full validitie, &c. and so to bee taken, and executed of all men &c.* which couple of *&c.* is an argument that he went on forward citing the *Breue* for his purpose, but how honestly, let every man iudge, the *Latine* being in this maner: *Ac propterea, valida, firma, & efficacia existere, & fore &c. decernimus. We decree therefore, that now (vpon this confirmation) they bee, and shalbe of force firme, and of efficacie.* And who is so blinde, that doth not see whether he will or no, that these words here inserted by this author *to haue bene*, are falsly thrust in by him, to confin his reader, and to haue him beleue, that his Holinesse declared in this *Breue*, that all things were of force by the Cardinals letters: which besides the most grosse imposture is most absurd, and against all law and reason, as is euery where shewed (the letters being no other, then from a Cardinall for the institution of a very great authority giuen by him without shewing any commission from his Holines, by which he might doe it.) But there is no dealing for this Author, if hee should deale honestly in any one matter, concerning the question in controuerse. But the Archpriest hath presumed to goe a litle further, in adding these words, *ab initio*. And in this Ediēt against the censure of *Paris*, he telleth his subiects, that the Pope had confirmed the Cardinals letters, as *validas ab initio, to haue beene of force from the beginning*, which if they could beate into the eares of the *blind-obedient*, it is as much as they desire. For they haue taken from their sight the view of all bookes, wherein they might discouer how falsly they are lead, and perswaded by guides blinder then themselues.

This declaration (saith he) and confirmation of his Holines, when



is came forth, euery man was of opinion, that all questions, and controuersies would be ended thereby: seeing that nothing was pretended before by the troublesome (so please it this foule mouthed fellow to tearme the Priests) but only to haue certaine intelligence of his Holinesse will and meaning. Doubtlesse all that meant wel and honestly, thought that here would haue been an end of all controuersies, not because the priests pretended nothing els, then to know his Holinesse will, for this author knoweth the contrary, but yet must say somewhat, although contrary to his owne knowledge, manifested in the 8 chapter of the *Apologie*, fol. 107. 108. 110. where he pretendeth to giue satisfaction to the reasons alleaged by the priests, before this *Breue* was made, but because the priests did alwayes offer (which also they perfourmed) that so soone as they should see any *Breue* in confirmation of this authoritie, they would yeeld themselves, notwithstanding the reasons which they had to the contrary. But this fellow imagineth, that vnlesse he practiseth his trade of lying almost in euery line, he shall lose that habit, which hath, & must get him all the credit which he looketh for. The priests gaue their words both in England, & in Rome (by them whom they sent thither) that al should be quiet vpon the sight of the *Breue*. But the Iesuites and Archpriest did not giue their words, that the peace should endure. And thereupon was the peace broken, and not by the Priests, as is set downe in al these bookes of the Priestes, and as yet neither is, nor can bee disprooued by this Authour, who heere vndertaketh an answere vnto them. I omitte the kindenesse, which was offered vnto the two priests by *F. Parsons*, it is sufficiently discovered in the bookes already set forth. The English Catholicke nation in Rome, here spoken of, vsed them indeed somewhat kindly, and friendly in all points to their power: but not for loue of the Iesuits, but vpon their owne honest dispositions: except it be meant by *M. D. Haddock*, and *M. Martin Array*, vnto whose lodging the two priests were sent: the one vpon the 22. of *April*, (for then he was set at libertie, and not presently vpon their sight of the *Breue*, or assurance that all would submit themselves, for this was done vpon the 8. or 9. of *April*, when *F. Parsons* did first bring them the *Breue* to copy it out,) the other



ther vpon the 6. of *May*, (for then, and not before was the other at libertie, & not presently vpon their assurance that all would be quiet, as here it is most falsly suggested.) And the trueth is, that this doctor, and his fellow Proctor did vse that kindnesse towards the two priests, as euery day when the priests went abroad, the doctor himselfe or his fellow Proctor would take the paines to rig vp their chamber, that no loose paper should be lost, which they might by any chance leaue behinde them. There was also an honest man in Rome, of the Catholick English nation, who in respect of olde acquaintance with one, or both the priests, promised to goe with one of them to visit the 7. Churches (an act of deuotion vsed by all that goe to Rome) but when the day came, he durst not goe, for feare lest the Iesuits should shew ouermuch kindnesse towards him, for this loue towards the priest. *Fa. Parsons* his loue and confidence specially, is not to be measured; who, as I haue bene enformed, objected to the priests, that they had brought with them a letter, which was indorsed or entituled to them in this style, *To your LL.* by which he, and others at that time, iested at their *Lordships*. And *F. Parsons* in his letter to *M. Bishop* of the 9. of *October* 1599. vrgeth the same; as also this author in the *Apologie*, cap. 9. fol. 135. But when these priests desired to see that letter, alledging oftentimes what comfort it would be vnto them, to see their owne *Lordships* (so often talked of by *F. Parsons* and other Iesuits) all the loue and confidence, especially which *F. Parsons* had, could not worke it: neither would this letter euer be shewed vnto them, as *M. Bishop* testifieth in the English booke, fol. 159. Although sayth he, it was most instantly desired, yea and said to haue been forged, as is set down fol. 127. and quietly let slip here in the *Apol* which vndertaketh to answere that booke.

Now follow certaine letters of *D. Bishop* to *M. Colington*, not when hee was at libertie (as here it is suggested) but a prisoner still, although at more libertie then *M. Charnocke* had: for hee was commanded to the Proctors house (as *M. Charnocke* was after his departure) and might not lie in the towne where hee would, and might haue liued without further charge, as also *M. Charnocke* might; for that they had agreed for their chamber, and diet for a certaine time, and payd their money beforehands



and were caried away to prison, before halfe the time was out; and were offered afterward to haue their diet, for so many daies as were behind of the reckoning, which were more then either of them had leaue to stay in Rome, after their seuerall enlargement, out of the Colledge. And as for this glose, that M. *Bishops* letter was written eight dayes after the Popes *Breue* was published, I should haue let it passe as one of this authors pety follies, this letter bearing date the 29. of April, as here is said, and the *Breue* bearing date the 6. of April, as in the leafe next before it is twice cited, and elsewhere often in the *Apologie*. But there is a further folly hereupon grounded, or at the least the like more grossely committed, to shew forth F. *Parsons* praises concerning a letter next following: at the end of which, thus sayth this author, *Thus wrote F. Parsons, even then when yet the Popes Breue was not come forth*: was not that kindly done and friendly of F. *Parsons*? But how is it proued, that this letter was written *even then*? Marke how hee prooueth it: *As appeareth* (sayth he) *for that this was written the 9. of April, and the Breue beareth date the 21. of the said moneth*. The *Breue* which hath hitherto borne date of the 6. of *April*, must now for to claw F. *Parsons*, be reported, yea and beleueed also by the *blind-obedient* to beare date the 21. of *April*. Is not this authour very greedy that F. *Parsons* should be commended, who will fetch a matter so farre off, and so farre from a knowen trueth, to further it; *ergo* not being more common in the schooles, then a *Breue* of the 6. of *April* for the Archpriests confirmation? This letter and other would aske longer scanning, then would recompense the paines, but to euery mans view they present an argument, that the peace was made vpon the Priests side; and therefore I will briefly goe ouer some marginall notes, which are made vpon these letters. And first I will beginne with the notes made vpon Master *Bishops* letter, whereupon Father *Parsons* his information, (who was to ouersee what hee writ into England) how that he had laboured for his libertie: he saith, that *hee had his libertie by F. Parsons procurement*. There is this note in the margent, *How then doeth hee denie this afterward*; but he telleth him not where: you must go looke for that. And in the meane time you must thinke, that M. *Bishop* said one thing at one time,

and



and at another time denied the same: which hee might very well doe; speaking first according to such informations, as *F. Parsons* gaue him, which afterward he might vnderstand to be false. The second note is this, *By this we see, how these men were pretenders, and could not expect their owne time.* And this note is made vpon *M. Bishops* good wishes to one man, and certificate, that vpon his peaceable behauour he should be remembred. And what doeth this proue, that the same party pretended any thing at all? vpon the next letter which is *F. Parsons* to *M. Collington*, and *M. Mush*, there is this note, *An obiection answered:* and that was, *Fa. Parsons is of an other body, and therefore no friend of theirs.* A shrewd obiection, and how is it answered? *He hath procured Seminaries for them: and if these Seminaries were for men of his owne vocation* (as in deed they are, and to make his faction the stronger) *yet they are all to one end, and one publique seruice of our countrey.* And if no man wil this belecue, let him looke into his actions of the yeeres 1596, and 97. when diuers priests were to come in the Spanish Armadoes, vnder pretence to restore the English to the Catholicke religion; Let their forced subscriptions to strange titles, proue *Fa. Parsons* and his agents their publique seruice of our countrey. But after this letter of *F. Parsons*, followeth another of *M. Mush* to him. And where *M. Mush* declareth how much he hath bene bound vnto the Societie: and that it is no ioy for him to be at variance with any: much lesse with him, or any of his societie; there is this note in the margin, *Ex ore tuo te iudico, &c.* If there be any relation to that, which followeth by *&c.* It is but an ordinary liuery, which this author giueth at his pleasure, *I iudge thee* (saith he) *by thine owne mouth.* as though *M. Mush* did now professe, that hee tooke ioy to be at variance with any, or that he denied, that he hath bene heretofore bound vnto the Societie, hauing bene many yeeres taken as a member thereof, although in the ende they would not admit him, as here it is confessed fol. 107. In this same letter *M. Mush* requesting, that *M. Bishop* and *M. Charnocke* might be sent home from their banishment, biddeth him not to feare any disturbance by them: for (saith he) *their owne hands will testifie against them, if they shall report, or attempt any euill.* Whereupon there is this note made, *This testimonie we accept now against them,*



them; But he sheweth not where they haue reported, or attempted any euill. Let this be shewed, and then let their testimony be vrged against them. To this letter doeth *Fa Parsons* reply, and speaking of the returne of these two priests, he putteth this case, *If their cooperation be understood, so worke with you by their letters, as here they promised, and I cannot doubt, but they will performe.* Vpon this place there is this note made, *Here we see the goodman was deceiued.* And why so good man? did they not cooperate with the priests in England for the making of peace? Are not their letters continually vrged against the priests in England, as exhorting them to peace? did they not testifie the copy of the *Breue* to be a true copy thereof, by which peace was made? Is not *M. Bishops* letter here inserted, a sufficient testimony of his cooperation; and what testimony is that, which is accepted here (in a marginal note vpon *F. Parsons* letter,) but of peace wrought or perswaded by them? And how then was the goodman deceiued? Perchance it was in that, which for all the rest also deceiued him; that was, hauing now gotten a *Breue* for confirmation of the Archpriest, he expected that his company might trample vpon the priests as them listed, and that now all the priests would be foole-ridden, or worse, and must not stirre for any iniury, whatsoever might be offered them; wherein in deed we may see, how the goodman was deceiued. Vpon the same letter there is a note made, that the reconciliation of *M. D. Bagshaw* was an outward shew. And after the letter this insinuation is giuen, that any indifferent man may perceiue how *F. Parsons* was desirous and carefull of peace. But of this more afterward when I shall discouer how he behaued himselfe for the putting all out of hope of peace.

Diuers other letters follow of *F. Garnet*, and the Archpriest to *F. Parsons*: all concluding, that there was a peace made, and that there was no doubt of any, but of *D. Bagshaw*, who (what cause soeuer he had to stand vpon the restitution of his good name) being accompted (as other were) for a *Schismaticke*, &c. yeelded himselfe. And this author confesseth here fol. 148. that it is most likely, that diuers of them ment plainly, and sincerely indeed: though of some of them it is doubted, that they made the peace only in external shew for the time, assuring themselves  
(saith



(saith he) that there would not want some probable occasiō, afterwards to break againe, & to lay the cause of breach vpon the other side, as in effect we see it did insue. But was the heate of faction and sedition so great in the Iesuites and the Archpriest, as the priests could perceiue it, & thereupon assure themselues, that there would not want some probable occasion to breake againe? Or had Fa. Parsons so laide the plot himselfe, that there should be no peace in England, but with such conditions as no honest priest could accept? Yet this wee haue, that a peace was made by some for peace sake, and by the rest also, at the least vpon this assurance, that afterward there would not want some probable occasion, to breake againe. But see how this fellow goeth on with his tale: For that (saith he) a new deuise being cast out shortly after, that satisfaction must be made to them for some former hard speeches vsed, or written against them in time of the contention, and that otherwise their good names should be taken from them. This was a sufficient match to put fire againe to all that, which had bene raked up before, by the induour of the foresaid peace. But this narration wil not passe so current. The priests haue set downe in the booke dedicated to his Holinesse, pag. 63. and in that to the *Inquisition*, pag. 59, 60. that after the peace was made, a Iesuit Fa. Jones by name, began to raise that wicked and senselesse slander of *schisme* against them. And M. Archpriest published *A Resolution*, pretended to come from Rome in confirmation of that wicked opinion of the Iesuits against the priests, and that the satisfaction which was demanded was of this infamy raysed, after the peace was made, and not of those wicked slanders, which were raysed by the Iesuites, the Archpriest, and their seditious adherents against the priests, before the peace was made, as here is falsely suggested. And this relation of the priests goeth still vncontrolled, and not disprooued by this authour. And by this might this question be solued, which followeth in the *Apologie*. Now then, all the question standeth in this, which part hath broken the peace, or which was most like to haue desire, to maintaine and conserue the same. For by this it is euident, that the Iesuites and Archpriest did breake the same peace, and put fire againe to all that which had bene raked up before. But marke I pray you, how substantially this question proposed is discussed by him: For discussing (saith he) of which



*controuersie, we might vse that argument of Cassius, Cui bono? who are like to receiue most good or hurt by the peace kept or broken?* Here you see what argument this authour might vse: you shall perchance hereafter vnderstand what argument hee will vse. For this in his owne conscience was no sufficient argument, or doubtlesse he would haue used it, having so great want of good arguments, as here he discouereth, yet the margent must cary this note. *The controuersie discussed, who did breake the peace:* to giue the reader to vnderstand, that here the controuersie is discussed, who perchance would thinke as litle thereof, as he who passeth through *Long lane*, by *Smithfield*, and looketh at the signe of *the Booke*, would thinke of *the Bible* if this note were not vpon the signe: *The Bible*. But as this authour might make this argument, so might the priests fit this answer; that such circumstances might bee iustly considered in controuersies, where no euidence is to be had which part had deserved blame, although in such also there might be iolly wrangling, euery circumstance almost being of force to make the harme or the good greater, which shold ensue vpon a peace broken or kept. But in this case there is no such want of euidence, as the matter must of necessitie be determined by any vncertaine circumstances. For the priests allege and pleade, that after the peace was made, *Fa. Jones* the Iesuit rayled out of hell that seditious, and most wicked slander of *schisme* against them, in which hee affirmed afresh, that they had liued, while they differed to obey the Archpriest, not yet confirmed by his Holinesse in that authority which the Cardinall *Caietan* had giuen him, and he had vsurped as an intruder, before he had the Popes letters for his lawfull exercise thereof. The priestes affirme also that the Archpriest after the peace made, did publish *A Resolution* pretended from Rome, wherein the priests were condemned for *Schismatickes*, who were refusers of the authority appointed, as is asorfaid. And this to haue beene done by the Archpriest, was so publicly knowen, that euery man, but the wilful deafe, did heare of it: & his letters flew about with this *Resolution*. And wil this author that this matter cōuined by facts, shold be discussed by cōceits & circūstances? If a man of possessions known to be very rich, should spoile a man by the high way, & should be



betaken with the maner, & brought before a Iudge, why might he not affirme that the poore mā assaulted him, & plead before the Iudge, *Cui bono*? He was a rich man & of great possessions, the other was a poore mā: what reason had he with such danger to seeke the spoile of the poore man? wil the Iudge leaue the euidence, and answere to *Cui bono*? But yet, notwithstanding that it is so euident, that the Iesuits and Archpriests brake the peace (as this author taking vpon him to answere these bookes) let-tereth the instances given passe by very quietly, not being able to confute them, lest hee should bring all but his like impudent companions, about his eares; the Archpriest his letters being common enough to disprooue his falshood: the petition also being extant which the priests made hereupon vnto him, that the question might be disputed among themselues, and (this being denyed) their sending to the most learned Vniuersitie of Paris, to haue it there decided; vpon the most immodest contempt whereof by the Archpriest, the priests were forced to flie to his Holines, and the Sea Apostolicke for succour: ) yet (I say) let vs see, how this author doth handle his *Cui bono*: For (sayth he) the Archpriest and the Clergie ioyned with him, enioyed by the peace all that they could desire: to wit, quiet establishment of their subordination, honour, reputation, rest, quietnesse, and his Holinesse confirmation of all their doings. The Iesuits also had as much as they could desire, and were satisfied in all points, as appeareth by their owne letters aboue recited. But on the other side ensued the quite contrary in all respects, so as it could not be imagined, but that by this pacification they receiued secundum hominem, much griefe and inward indignation. See you not the pregnancie of this authors wit, & what a strong argument he might vse? A tyrant hauing obtained by such meanes as he vsed, to be admitted as a lawfull king, beginneth againe to shewe his disposition amongst his subiects; especially against such as would not at the first yeeld themselves, or acknowledge his vsurped authoritie: and when he hath destroyed them, or as many of them as he may, or hath a wicked mind to destroy, what hindereth him, that he cannot lay the blame of this breach of peace vpon those whom he destroyed, and plead for himselfe, *Cui bono*? For he enioyed by the peace, all that he could desire, to wit, quiet establishment of his king-  
dome,



dome, honour, reputation, rest, quietnesse, his confirmation also perchance by some higher power. His intruders also, or setters on in that course, had as much as they could desire, and were satisfied in all points: but on the other side ensued quite contrary in all respects. So as it could not be imagined, but that by this pacification, and the tyrants atchieving the soueraignty, they receiued secundum hominem, much grieve and inward indignation. Is not *Cui bono* a stout argument? But this comparison is odious, betweene a tyrant, and a graue Catholike Archpriest. There is no comparison made betweene them, but it is declared how foolish an argument this author might haue vsed, if he would haue vrged *Cui bono*. But yet in this narration of honor, and reputation given to the Archpriest, there are two things to be noted; the one is, that it is most false which is here inserted, that the Archpriest, and the Cleargie ioyned with him, enjoyed his Holinesse confirmation of all their doings. His Holinesse confirmed the Cardinal Caietans letters, by which M. Blackwell was made an Archpriest, and a Superiour: but to make this stretch to the confirmation of all that, which hee, and others ioyned with him did in that time, is both absurd, and a most impious slander of the Pope, their doings having beene most wicked and scandalous, yea and most iniurious to many Catholike priests, as it was openly enough seen by diuers others, but principally by that infamous imputation of *schisme, sedition, &c.* The other thing, which is here to be noted, is, that this being supposed, that all these had what they could desire, and contrariwise the other had all the contrary, the Iesuits and the Archpriest could not without an exceeding bad intention, raise again that slander of *Schisme* against the priests, after the peace was made; knowing, or being bound to know, that the priests could not in conscience put it vp, howsoeuer before they dispensed for peace sake to forgieue them their first outrage.

But now followeth the argument belike which this author will vrge: for all this is onely what he might doe. And this new argument consisteth vpon two principall points: The first is, that supposing all the foresaid honours on the one side, and the disgraces on the other side, were digested by vertue of patience, humilitie, obedience, and mortification of minde, his  
reader



reader muſt conſider, *how matters ſtood with them, or ſome of them at the leaſt, and with the Archpriſt at the coming of the Breue.* The ſecond is, *how theſe matters ſtood with them and the Counſell, and ſome great men of the aduerſary part.* The firſt conſideration is ſo ſlenderly handled, and in a manner annexed with the ſecond, as if the laſt were the onely thing, vpon which this authour would rely, for the declaration of this queſtion, which he thus propoſed: *which part hath broken the peace?*

The matters as they ſtood betwixt the prieſts and the Archpriſt, he explicateth by an appeale, which ſome prieſts had made a little before the *Breue* came, which was an argument that *the wound was greene*: and his reader muſt vnderſtand, that by this appeale there was *an egregious faction meant*: becauſe the Appeale was made in the names of the preſent Appellants, and all others that ſhould ioyne themſelues vnto them. (which claufe was after the Appeale, and onely in a poſtſcript, as it is ſet downe in the booke to the Inquiſition, pag. 52.) And to colour this matter the better, the date of the Appeale is transported to the poſtſcript which he citeth, *which is* (ſaith he) *againſt the nature of juſt Appeales*: for which you muſt take his credit. But let vs grant, that theſe Appellants had miſtaken *Panormitane*, explicating the rubricke of the chapter, *Olim de occaſionibus*, & had put in this claufe into their Appeale, (which as is ſaid is in a poſtſcript after the Appeale) how is it prooued that there is *an egregious faction meant* thereby? How much better might it be ſayd, that there was a marueilous contempt of the Sea Apoſtolike committed by the Archpr. in ſuſpending the Appellants from the uſe of their faculties, after this Appeale made to the Sea Apoſtolike? Againe, if we ſhall conſider the backwardneſſe of the Appellants, to doe or attempt any thing which might be offenſiue to any (which they ſufficiently ſhewed, in that they hereupon reſtrained to uſe their faculties) and the forwardneſſe of the Archpr. who would uſurpe ſuch an authoritie, before he was confirmed by his Holineſſe (ſufficiently declared by this irreuerence, to the Sea Apoſtolike, in taking away from the Appellants, the uſe of their faculties for Appealing) it will be euident to the indifferent iudge, which part was more likely to haue a bad meaning, for *factio* or diſturbance



bance of the Church. *But this was denied perhaps (saith he) underhand by the persecutors themselves &c.* and so hee falleth into that point, of the standing of matters betweene the priests, and the Counsel, which I will leaue a little, and trie, whether besides this coniecture already giuen, of the Archpriests meaning, and his factious adherents, I can allége any other matter, whereby it may be coniectured, that the Iesuits, and Archp. did meane an *egregious faction*, whatsoever shew they would make of peace, first occurreth a letter which was written from Rome, by *M. Martin Array*, one of the two Proctors appointed by the Archpr. and the Clergie vnited vnto him, and allowed by his Holinesse, as in this letter he affirmeth. Which letter, being a pretended relation of such principall matters, as you shall heare, was eyther penned by *Fa Parsons*, or not without his priuie: being (as all Rome can testifie) the principall agent against the priests, and one who thought nothing could be well done to his minde, vnlesse he were himselfe at the doing therof, as appeared by his apprehending them, his keeping them, his examining them, and such like his charitable offices. This letter beareth date the 20. of *February 1599*. And herein is his deere friend certified, that the matter, about which the two priests went to Rome, was committed by his holinesse speciall commission, to *Card. Caietane*, and *Burghese*, to be examined, and heard by way of congregation at the English Coll. it selfe. *And so it was (saith he) upon Wednesday the seuenteenth of this moneth: when after sundry informations had from Acaisius Fiscal, of his Hol Congregation of reformation, that had taken their seuerall examinations (by his attourney Fa. Parsons) upon their oathes. And after they (the Cardinals) had read and viewed such letters, memorials and papers, as the Ambassadors had brought with them, they came ioyntly together to the Colledge upon the foresayd day, and with them the sayd Fiscal. And there hauing a conuenient tribunall provided in forme of iudgement (a couple of chaires set at a table covered with a greene cloth) they heard the whole cause, (but God knoweth who pleaded it.) And first each of the Ambassadors confession and declaration (that is, as much, and what pleased Fa Parsons) seuerally read by the Notary of the cause, (Fa Henry Tichborne a Iesuite) which were long, and euery one of them more then an houres reading. And therefore perchance to*  
auoide



aside tediousnes, there was a little read here and there, where  
 Fa. Parsons had turned downe a leafe, and his fellow Iesuit (the  
 foresaid Notary of the cause) was made acquainted therewith,  
 and read accordingly. And then was each of them willed to say,  
 if he had any thing to addre to his declaration more then hee had set  
 downe, M. Bishop would say nothing, for which as was sayd, the  
 Cardinals were offended with him: M. Charnocke deliuered  
 somewhat, vntill Fa. Parsons did breake him off. And after this  
 their letters and papers brought with them were scene againe by the  
 foresayd Iudges, whereof the most part were translated into Latine.  
 (Is it likely that the priests would write to his Holinesse in En-  
 glish? for the petitions were to him, which were brought by  
 the two priests to Rome, and concerned their businesse) And  
 besides that, were also Fa. Parsons, Rector of the Colledge, and Fa.  
 Henry Tichborne Prefect of the studies willed to be present. (These  
 were besides themselves: for as hath been sayd Fa. Tichborne  
 the Iesuit was the foresayd Notary, and Fa. Parsons the man that  
 had take their examinations) to interpret any thing that should be  
 needfull both the Iudges and the two priests spake both Itali-  
 an and Latine) And after this againe were both Ambassadors cal-  
 led in ioyntly, (for M. Bishop was locked vp againe, as soone as  
 he had heard his examinations read) as also M. Haddocke, and  
 my selfe as procurators of the Archpresbyter, and of the Clergie uni-  
 ted to him, appointed by letters from them, and allowed here by his Ho-  
 linesse, with whom we had been, and had audience particular about  
 this affaire before. And being come in, we were willed, as procurators,  
 to speake what wee had to say in this behalfe. But you must vnder-  
 stand, that this charge was so secretly giuen by the Iudges, as  
 the two priests there also present did not heare it. And these  
 procurators, being willed to speake like Proctors, sayd not one  
 word, but Fa. Parsons at their entrance began to declare vnto  
 the Cardinals, that those two were Proctors for the Archpr.  
 and that one of them was a Doctor of Diuinitie, and the ne-  
 phew of a Cardinal, and the brother of a Martyr, (agnominations  
 able to credit the best Proctors in the world) After this pre-  
 amble, hee told the Cardinall, what a perillous diuision was  
 made in England: and that those proctors, although they were  
 very loth to deale against their brethren there present, yet for  
 the



the loue of Iustice, they were contented to be imployed in this action against them, and that they had a libell or bill of complaint against them. At which words D.Haddocke (without any word speaking himselfe) deliuered vp a libell to the Card. But let vs heare what M. Array certifieth his friend of his speeches or his fellow Proctors, when (as he sayth) they were bidden to speake as Proctors. *Our speech in effect was* (sayth he, when they sayd not one word) *that albeit it grieveth vs much to be drinen to accuse or pleade against our brethren Priests, that had beene of the same Colledge and Vniuersitie here in Rome, and had gone hence into England iointly to labour, and aduenture our liues for the same cause of the Catholike faith, though before them, (and were quickly wearie thereof) yet their maner of proceeding had beene, and was so prejudiciall to common peace (these good Proctors were 12 yeeres before, or there about gone out of England) and vnion, and so scandalous to all good and honest men, that either we must oppose our selues against them in the name of our head (they meane the Arch-priest who was not their head, they liuing at Rome) and of all the rest of our Catholike body in England and abroad (they wil make their foresayd head a yong Pope) or els we should seeme to betray the same cause impugned by them.* O scrupulous conscience! who would thinke that all his tale were onely an imagination, what might haue been sayd, neither he, nor his fellow Proctor hauing as yet vttered one word? But let vs heare this saint make an end of this lewde and lowde lie. *Wherefore wee prayed their Graces (in what language?) not to be scandalized to see this diuision amongst vs, for that these were the moaths (O gentle mouthes speake) that did breed in the best clothes, and the wormes (O noble Proctor) that were commonly found under the barke of euery tree, if they were not looked to in time, and that this happened also in the verie primitiue Church, permitted by God for the better prooffe and exercise of good men. And that this was a very heresie in maners, & actions, as th' other in Protestants was in faith and Religion: & that this would breake into that in time, if that it were not looked into, as in diuers (of the Iesuits darlings) it had done already, and must needs doe: For that it was contention founded vpon the same grounds of emulation, euery ambition, hatred, couetousnes and libertie of life, as the other heresie was, and wrought a spirit conforme to that in all respects*



*pects &c.* This letter being written 3. or 4. dayes after that the priests had appeared before the Cardinals; and after a friendly composition demanded by the Proctors, and pretended by the Cardinals, Can it be an argument of any other thing, then a desire to continue strife, and diuision? Could the most hatefull professed enemy in the world haue disgorged his filthy stomache in more spitefull termes? Had this bene vttered by the Proctors before the Cardinals against the two priests; with shame ynough it had bene written into England, but without the least sort of honesty, the Proctors themselues hauing most humbly desired a friendly composition. But the Proctors not hauing vttered one word (much lesse in these most vile termes) who may not iustly iudge, that when this letter was written (which was after the apparance of the two priests as appeareth by the date) that it was not meant by that side, that euer there should be peace? But marke I pray you yet a most wicked relation, and which may conuince more evidently (if it be possible) that these fellowes would not haue peace. *And then* (saith he) *we gaue vp a writing which before had bene exhibited vnto his Holines, & was remitted hither as it seemeth,* (it seemed so indeed, for D Haddocke had it ready to giue vp to the Cardinals so soone as F. Parson had told his tale) *that these men came hither onely to trouble the peace of England, and to reuiue stirres in Rome, and that of their owne heads, as it seemeth, for that they had brought no one letter of credence with them of Superior, or othar to his Holines Protector, or other man in Rome &c. wherefore we desired remedy in this behalfe, and exhibited diuers letters of the doctors of Doway, and M. Wright the deane of Cortrac, and of other graue men of our nation to this effect.* All these letters here said to haue bene exhibited by the Proctors, were no other then one letter from the D. of Doway, and an other from M. Wright which are set in the *Apologie* fol. 123, 126. whereof the first beareth date the 25. of Octob. 1598. and the second 10 Nouemb. 1598. and they were both to the Protector. Yet must M. Martins friend belecue that he and his fellow Proctor did vpon the 17. of February exhibit many other letters to the Protector, (who was chiefe Iudge, notwithstanding the exceptions taken against him at this time,) But how were these letters exhibited? In no other sort, then



as a part of that writing: for they were inserted in it, as may appeare by the writing it selfe, of which I haue seene a copy. But let this passe, let vs heare what he saith was answered by the priests to all these grieuous accusations; *Against all which* (saith he) *the Ambassadors were able to say little, and willing to say lesse, but onely excused their owne intentions, and asked pardon, if they had giuen scandall by their maner of proceeding, more then they euer meant.* But put the case indeed, as it was, and as the Card. *Burgessius* without doubt will acknowledge, and the Iesuits with all the rest of that faction then present, must auouch it one day against their owne soules, will they, nill they, that *Fa. Tichborne* the Iesuit (who here also supplied the place of a publique Notary, and read this Libel) had no sooner done reading it, then *M. Bishop* required, that the Proctours might take their othes, that the Libel contained nothing but trueth. To which when the Card. *Caietan* would not consent, he requested that a copy of the Libel might be deliuered vnto him, & his fellow, that they might make their answeere vnto it, as most false, and iniurious: whereat *D. Hadd.* who had giuen vp the writing, stepped to the table, & requested that it might not be deliuered vnto them, but that all things rather should be peaceably concluded. To which the Card. *Caietan* presently consented, the sooner perchance for ioy, that both the Proctours were not dumbe: for before this acte of *D. Haddocke*, it is most certaine that neither of them spake one word, howsoeuer that his fellow vanteth of his workmanship, when he was bidden to speake *like a Proctor*. Now would I aske of an indifferent Iudge, whether it were possible that there could be any desire of peace in fellowes, who in cold blood, and after three nights rest (if rancor and malice would suffer them to rest) would write thus into England, cleane contrary to all trueth in a matter of such moment, as was the handling of the cause, concerning which all the diuision was which was, or was like to be in England? And if this were necessary to be done, lest that they should seeme to betray the cause impugned by the two priests, (as this fellow saith in this letter) must not consequently this cause be a most fowle cause, which must be vpholden with such shamelesse falshood? could these fellowes thinke that Master *Bishop*, or Master *Char-*  
*nocke,*



*nocke*, should euer come to the sight of this relation of theirs, and helde themselves from declaring it to be (as in deede it is) a most false, wicked, and malicious information? or can these men thinke, that these means were meanes for peace, and not rather occasions to breake peace, when they should come to light? But this was not the first plot which was layd, by which their intentiō is discovered neuer to haue had peace. There is another letter written by *Fa. Baldwyn* (as hoat a shot, as any of the rest) dated 25. *Febr.* 1599. out of Flanders to *Paris* to *M. D. Cecill*: wherein also it may appeare, that these fellows meant, that there should be no peace, when they strived so greatly for the whetstone in their malicious letters against these priests. Thus he writ. *I haue receiued, &c. I thinke you haue understood how the Ambassadors Charnocke, and Bishop haue bene intreated by his Holinesse, their articles and cause of their iourney. They were imprisoned upon S. Thomas of Canterbury his day, and remaine yet prisoners. They haue bene examined by a Fiscall, and now they shall haue their sentence by two Cardinals, Burghese and Caietan. Their request was, there might be no subordination: and if it must be, then some one which fauoured them might be created Bishop: for which they named, D. Gifford, Bagshaw, Collington, or Bishop. They say, if they had not their request, experience would teach, quod indignabitur libertas, si prematur, (that is to say, that liberty would be offended, if it were pressed) These were their words. Now the case is altered, and they seeme changed, and sory that they tooke such a iourney in hand: seeing that nothing else, but ambition hath egged them thus farre foorth, &c.* Could the spreading of these most notorious falshoods, be signes of any other thing, then of a desire that there should bee no peace? How could these fellows thinke or perswade themselves, that when these tales came to the eares of the two priests thus abused, they would not be contradicted? was this it, which is ment by the *Apologie*, fol. 148. where it is sayd, that the Priests assured themselves, that there would not want some probable occasion afterward to breake againe? Was the authour of the *Apologie* priuie to these occasions? But how could these be occasions of the breach: seeing that *M. Bishop* and *M. Charnocke* knewe not of this false dealing, as being in banishment, besides that the



breach was made againe, before that these wicked dealings came to their knowledge. You are therefore to vnderstand, that these are brought to shewe that these fellowes could not haue any desire of peace, who could disperse such false & wicked tales against those Priests, and in them against all the rest, by whom these were imployed to his Holinesse. And because perchance they perceiued, that these & other their plots would not fadge to their mind, and that notwithstanding the *solemnne inquirie of their life, and maners* commanded by Cardinall Cate-tan, 10. Nouemb. 1598. the treatise of *schisme*, and other iniuries offered vnto them, and to the prielts imployed by them) they did all (contrary to their aduersaries expectations) submit themselves presently vpon the sight of his Holines *Breue*, the Iesuits were constrained to goe to worke so openly, as all the world cryeth out shame vpon them. For when peace was made, they fell to a fresh declaring, that the refusers of the appointed authority had bene *Schismatikes*: which in all reason they thought was more then a *probable occasion* to breake the peace againe, and that their barbarous handling of those priests which were first sent to Rome, to haue dealt with his Holinesse, would be such a terrour to them, as they would neuer send the second time, so as they might tyrannize at pleasure, ouer whom they listed, and principally intended (perchance at the first) as not being now very likely to put vp the second time so scandalous, and vnworthy reproches: nor (as they hoped) would be forward to attempt againe to get some remedy.

This first point being sufficiently declared, how matters stood betweene the Archpriest, and his adherents on the one part, and with the priests on the other part: nowe followeth this Authours information, how they stood with the counsell, and great men of the one part, and the Priestes on the other part. For out of these two considerations hee will haue his reader to gather, *which part broke the peace, or was more likely to keepe it.* The first consideration he dispatched briefly, and declared that *the wound was greene*, when the *Breue* came: which he proueth by an Appeale made by some of the priests: for which the Appellants were by the Archpriest deprived of the vse of their faculties. The seconde hee beginneth  
in



in shewing, howe by certaine wordes in the Appeale it may bee gathered, that there was an *egregious faction*, as denised perhaps under-hand by the persecutors themselves. See how he falleth into the consideration with a *perhaps*, and then goeth thus forwards: *who hauing with them at London at this time (if he were not very lately returned) D. Bagshaw, called vp as is supposed, by his owne procurement, it is very likely they agreed with him, that in no case whatsoeuer determination should come frō Rome, peace should be made, or kept with the Archpriest, and Iesuits.* How many things must a man suppose, before he come to imagine, that one man meant not to haue peace with the Archpriest and Iesuits? which, if it should be graunted to this fellow, how would he hereupon inferre, that there was an *egregious faction* meant by those Appellants, of which this man of whome hee speaketh, was none, but rather of a contrary disposition, as this author confesseth in this place: where he addeth, *which point it may be. Ma. Collington and Ma. Mush, two of the three Appellants, did somewhat guesse at, when they shewed so much doubt to the Archpriest, as before you haue heard, of bringing D. Bagshaw into this reconciliation?* And to further this conceit, that M. Doctor Bagshaw had dealings with the Councell, there is a letter of a reuerend priest dated the 15. of April 1599. which is full of foolish ieaiousies, and senslesse surmises, it being well known, that M. Doct. Bagshaw was sent for from Wisbich to London, to answer for his life, being most falsely and vnchristianlike accused, to haue had part in that Spanish treachery, for which Squire was put to death: although this author in the 13. chap. fol. 207. doth most shamelessly auouch, that *as soone as euer they (the priests) vnderstood that their two messengers were restrained in Rome (which was not before the 29. of December) and not like to preuaile (which could not be so soone known in England) then D. Bagshaw was sent for from Wisbich to London to treat with the Councell:* and all England can witnesse, that he was sent for by the Councell about the Michaelmas before the two priests were imprisoned. But next after these authenticall surmises of one of the fellowe vnited brethren (but a reuerend one, and therefore must carry credit, howsoeuer this Apologie hath cracked it) there followed another letter of another reue-



rend priest, who affirmeth that D. Bagshaw is at the last constrained to yeeld his obedience to their Superiour, with therest of his confederats: *If it be true (sayth hee) that M. Mush and some others affirme.* And yet there is a greater argument, but it is against M. Bluet. *If (sayth this author) the said keeper of Wisbich castle doe not greatly abuse M. Bluet.* And this standing vponlo nice a point, I will leaue to them, who haue will to compare their honesties together, and conclude contrarily to this authors conclusion, fol. 153. for there he concludeth in this manner: *By this then and diuers other wayes, which we leaue to speake of heere,* (the priests are much bound to him for sparing them) *it is easie to see what manner of negotiation these men had in hand, when the Breue came, and how farre they were embarked, and intangled, &c.* (you must cōceiue some strange linke by this &c.) *with the Councell at this very time.* How gladly would any blind man see this, and bragge when he hath done with the best sighted? For who, that hath his eyes, can see any such matter out of these fond surmises, out of their owne letters, and a memoriall of a man of whome they themselves haue some doubt, whether hee did not abuse the party, whome he tooke for his author? who doth not rather see, to what poore shifts this author is driven, who to determine so weightie a question, as he proposed fol. 148. *which part hath broken the peace,* can say nothing, but *perhaps,* and *as is supposed,* and *it is very likely,* and *it may be,* and *it is thought:* with other such foolish suspicions and doubts, of which all this discourse is full, from the first entrance into the *consideration of much more consequence,* fol. 144. to this conclusion, *By this then,* fol. 153. How much more directly doe the priests in all places solue this question, affirming without any such foolish shuffling, that the Iesuits first (namely F. Jones) began this breach, by broaching afresh, that the priests were *schismatickes?* And the Archpriest seconded him with a most seditious letter which hee sent abroad: wherein hee signified, that he had receiued a *resolution from the mother Citie, that the refusers of the appointed authoritie were schismatikes.* And this haue the priests set downe in their bookes, to haue beene the cause of the breach: and this cannot be denyed to haue beene done by the Archpriest after the peace was made: although this author



thor in chap. 11. fol. 167. taketh notice, that in the booke to his Holinesse, pa. 62. there is this marginall note, *Origo nouarum contentionum fuit Archipresbyteri Epistola violenta. The beginning of new contentions, was a violent Epistle of the Archpriest.* And vpon this note, he exclaimeth in his religious maner against the priests, that they would breake out againe vpon an angry epistle. And he runneth himselfe so out of breath, as although this note is set at the very bottome of the 62. page, he could not step ouer to the 63. page, where some part of this angry epistle is thus set downe. *Ab vrbe &c. we haue receiued a resolution from the mother Citie, that the refusers of the appointed authority, were schismatics.* But the marginall note was ynough for him to exercise his milde spirit against the priests: and by concealing wherefore that note was made, and what was in the discourse, to coulsen his blinde reader, who must not once looke into the priests bookes, for feare lest their guides falsenesse be discovered.

And thus haue I shewed, how the Iesuits & the Archpriests want of consideration hath bene the cause of all these present broiles, and that this diuision should not onely not be cured, but be brought in time to a greater breach, as by the euent we haue seene performed. Whereby also it appeareth how false this narration is of this author. For first (saith he) *under the foresaid pretence of a satisfactiō to be made vnto them of their fames wounded, delay was made of reconciliation.* Hath this fellow so soone forgotten himselfe what he said in this 10. Chap. fol. 147. out of M. Archpriests letter to Fa. Parsons, dated the 3. of Iune 1599? *I was inforced (saith he) vpon their contentions, and contemptuous behauour (that is their appeale from him to the Pope, as is set downe in the booke to the Inquisition epist. 52. & 53.) to suspend the vse of faculties in M. Collington, M. Mush, and M. Heburne.* But now God be blessed, vpon the sight of the Breue Apostolicall, that you sent, they haue in such maner submitted themselues, that I haue giuen them restitution of their losses. The Breue also of the 17. of August 1601. excludeth al delay, affirming, that so soone as euer the priests did see the former Breue, they presently submitted themselues, yet must this fellow to keepe himselfe in vre (as if all his discourses were bastards if they were in the beginning, middle, or ending any other then false tales) tell his Reader, that



that there was *delay made* of reconciliation vnder pretence of hauing satisfaction ; which howsoeuer the accusers of the priests shall make to God, they are neuer able to make to them. *Then* (saith he) *new quarels pickt, new complaints fained, new exaggerations made, by words and writings both against the Archpriest* (the causes hereof are layd downe before, and the whole story at large sent to the Inquisition) *the Cardinals protections, and F. Parsons by name, especially concerning the treatie of their two messengers in Rome.* Perchance *Fa. Parsons* letter of the 9. of October 1599, which he sent into England, France, and Flanders, and where not? came to some of their hands, and also the letter of *M. Martin Array*, and *Fa. Baldwins* bolt to *D. Cicyll* before cited came to be examined, and were euident arguments of falsehood (to say no worse) and lewd dealing, and the breach renewed before by the Iesuits, and Archpriest (as is shewed) might giue the priests iust cause to looke further into the matter, then they could before suspect: but when were these quarels pickt? by whom? or how followed? marke I pray you how he falleth into a story impertinent to these controuersies. The peace was made by the priests in *May 1599* as in this chapter is confessed, the breach was presently after made by the Iesuits, and the Archpriest, as this author doeth in a manner confesse, in that neither of himselfe, nor prouoked thereto by the priests their books he will come neere to this point, which is the most principall in this present controuersie; and now he will tel you a tale of *M Charnocke* his returne, which was a yeere after, to wit in *May 1600.* who (as he saith) *was invited to come home, and so hee did,* no doubt much against this fellowes will, who (if I am not deceiued) was the cause of his *banishment and confinement* without any maintenance, to keepe him in case for euer comming home, and to aggrauat the matter *M. Charnocke* is said to haue made a *ridiculous appeale* from the sentence of the two Cardinals. But I thinke that this fellowes worship did not laugh when he heard of it. Yea and more then this *he came to Paris*, and tooke degree of Bachelor of diuinitie, which perchance troubled this fellowes worship, as much as the appeale, and thereupon he doeth so iuggle it with *M. Bishop* his taking degree of doctor, *forbidden* (as he saith) *by an expresse Breue*, that his Reader may thinke



thincke *M. Charnocke* had committed some great offence, and yet this author meane nothing lesse, but that he layde all the offence vpon doctor *Bishop*, who was before, and not at that time made Doctor as he would seeme to say, and was lawfully made, and worthily, and no way contrary to the true meaning of the *Breue*, which was gotten of the Pope not against the doctoring without approbation, as here is most falsly noted in the margent, but against the doctoring of yong men, and such (by explication of those, who procured the *Breue*) as would take the degree more timely, then the ambitio of their aduersaries could well like of. But to returne to his tale of *M. Charnocke*. Here then (that is at *Paris*) it was resolved (saith he) that *M. Charnocke* notwithstanding his Holines prohibition, (that is to say, the sentence of the two Cardinals, *Caictane*, and *Burghese*, from which he had lawfully appealed, which also *M. doctor Ely* confirmeth in his notes vpon the *Apologie* pag 157. and thereby set himselfe free vntill the matter were againe discussed) and his owne oath to the contrary (which he neuer tooke nor was any offered him, when the sentence here specified fol. 155. was shewed him by *Fa. Parsons* in forme of a letter to the same Father being then Rector, or the vice Rector of the Colledge) should goe into England vnder pretence of lacke of meanes to liue abroad. (This was the cause of his Appeale in *Lorraine* before he came to *Paris*, as *M. Archpr.* vnderstood by a letter from *M. Artur Pitts*, the Deane of *Le Verdun*, and Chancellor of the Legacion in *Lorraine*) and that onely for fashion sake he should aduise *Cardinall Burghesius* thereof, which he did by a litle short contemptuous letter of the 25. of May. The letter was written in very humble maner, as I vnderstood by those that saw it, and with the priuitie of others in *Paris*, who would soone haue caused any such stile to haue bene altered and as it was not perchance very long so (as it appeareth by the authors relation) it was not very short (for here he sayth, that the *Cardinall* did answere all the obiections, or cauillations touched therein, about their hard usage, & iniurious sentence giuen against them, and how he had appealed, which this author calleth points of the letter) nor in any such maner contemptible, for who can thinke, that this fellow were so modest, that amongst all his cōtemptuous tearms,



and narrow seeking for the least matters to bring the priests into contempt, he would not set downe some one phraſe or other, by which it ſhould appeare to his Reader, that the letter was a contemptuous letter. To the which (ſaith he) the moſt honorable, and gracious good Cardinal answered with great patience and modeſtie the fifteenth of September in the year 1600, beginning his letter thus: Reuerend in Chriſt, as my brother, your letters written at Paris the 28 of May, about your iourney into England, were delivered more ſlowly to my hand then I could haue wiſhed, both that I might haue answered ſooner, and haue diſſwaded that iourney of yours, if they had come vnto me, before your departure out of France, for that I thinke the newes of your departure will bee vngreatfull to his Holines, as it is vnto vs, for ſo much as it is both againſt obedience, and againſt an expreſſe prohibition, and againſt your owne promiſe confirmed with an othe, and is thought will giue occaſion of new contention and troubles in England &c. Thus farre in the Apologie. And afterward this author declareth how the Cardinal did anſwere the obiections, which M. Charnocke had made, and that notwithstanding this, M. Charnocke did not onely perſeuere in England in the exerciſe of his function of prieſthood, hauing openly incurred the cenſure of ſuſpenſion, but alſo returned a more vndatiſfull anſwere, then was his former letter, which hee prooueth by thoſe wordes in M. Charnockes letter, *Quam licet tunc eluderem fraudem, ad maiorem ſecuritatem vicerq; ab eo abſolui curauimus*: although I did delude at that time the deſceit used in making vs ſwear, to fulfill the ſentence giuen againſt vs, yet both of vs afterward procured our ſelues for more ſecurity to be abſolved from this othe.

This letter of the Cardinall Burghieſe is ſet downe at large in the booke to the Inquiſition pag 84. 85. 86. and 87. and immediately doth M. Charnockes letter follow, where who will may ſee them. I will here onely touch ſo much of M. Charnockes letter, as is in anſwere to that part of the Cardinals here cited, leaving the reſt to men of iudgement, to conſider whether M. Charnocke did not what he did, vpon ſufficient ground to ſaue himſelfe harmeleſſe from all cenſures, and blameleſſe in the opinion of any honeſt man. Thus hee beginneth his reply, which this author taxeth ſo deeply for vndatiſfulneſſe.

*Moſt*



Most Reverend, and most illustrious prince: your letters dated at Rome 15. Septemb. 1600. I did receive at London in England upon the 21. of the next moneth following. To the which I returned this answer, with as great respect as the law was in which they were written: I doe not well understand how the notice of my going into England, should be ungratefull, either to his Holinesse, or unto your Highnesse, when as neither a most loving Father, nor a most iust Iudge, can be ignorant, that foode is as needfull for the living, as punishment for the offender. The Rector, or Vicerector of the English College in Rome was appointed by letters of the most illustrious Cardinall Caietan of good memory, and of your Highnesse, dated from both your palaces 21. of Aprill 1599. to signifie unto vs in your names, that we should not presume for a time to goe without leave into the kingdomes of England, Scotland, or Ireland, but should live quietly, peaceably, and religiously in other Catholike countreys, where we should be appointed by you, and that we should procure the conservation of peace every where among the English Catholickes. If either of them had signified unto vs in your names, or in the names of any other, where banished and confined men should have had those things which were necessary to sustaine life, and that these things had bene at hand, I might have bene charged with disobedience, and breach of an expresse commandement, not obeying so pious an intencion of the decree, which layd upon me a most grievous (howsoever undeserved) punishment, as being hereby made somewhat tollerable, and the oath had not bene a bode of so great wickednesse, if I had taken any, not to returne into my Countrey. M. Acarius upon the 22. of April 1599. having first proposed unto vs, not to returne into our Countrey, under paine of suspension, did after by F. Parsons suggestion, among other things, exact also an oath of this: which deceit although then I deluded, for the greater securitie we both procured to be absolved from it. Furthermore, if M. Acarius did receive no commission from the most illustrious Cardinall Caietane and your Highnesse, or that this commission was recalled, before that he came unto vs, I know not what promise that is, with which any man may charge me, that I confirmed it with an oath: but it is evident by the testimonie of F. Parsons and also by your owne letters of the 21. of April 1599. to the Rector, or Vicerector of the English College in Rome, that either Acarius received no commission from you, or that it was recalled



called before he came to vs. For in these letters the Commission is giuen to the Rector or Vicerector of the College, to signifie vnto vs, as prisoners in the College, in your names what we were to doe. And so doth *M. Charnocke* proceede, answering euery part and parcell in the Cardinals letters, and shewing out of the most approved Canonistes, that his fact was lawfull, and that he incurred no censures, by returning into his Countrey, after his Appeale made in *Lorraine*. And by this it is made manifest, what the deceit was, and whose, which *M. Charnocke* telleth the Cardinall he did delude, and the cauils are also answered, which are here made in the *Apologie*, where this authour would aske: *who could absolue from an oath exhibited by the immediate Commissary, or Delegate of his Holinesse?* For to this is answered, that if the immediate Commissary, or Delegate of his Holinesse aske an oath, beyond his Commission, any man may absolue from it. But neither was here any immediate Commissary, nor Delegate of his Holinesse, but a fellowe suborned (as it should seeme) by *F. Parsons* to come doe some acte at his request. For *M. Ascarisius* seeming to read what he proposed, as sent to the Colledge by the two Cardinals, had not his lesson so perfect, as *Fa. Parsons* had it without the booke. And vpon *Fa. Parsons* after-speech, *M. Ascarisius* repeated his lesson, and thrust in this deuise, that the priests should sweare not to goe into *Englang* without leaue, whereas before there was onely a censure of suspension to be incurred, if they did retorne without leaue, which censure also, as *M. Charnocke* dooth demonstrate in his answere to the Cardinall, was suspended by his Appeale. But this matter is more aggrauated yet against *M. Charnock* for that the sentence was such, as otherwise they were bound to accept, and fulfill vnder paine of deadly sinne, that is to say, they were bound to goe begge or starue in some one place or other, out of their countrey, vnlesse this fellowe can perswade his Reader, that they had some allowance for their maintenance, to which if any man had bene compelled to binde himselfe by oath, I would aske any indifferent man, whether there could be *maioris iniquitatis vinculum*, a bond of greater iniquitie, especially if the Iurors were neuer conuicted of any crime (as their case was) which bond all learned men doe say, is no bond. And if this  
poore



poore companion his opinion (that every decree did binde vnder deadly sinne) were receiued, all the Canonists must goe for egregious fooles, who affirme both that some decrees are *ipso iure*, of no force (and *M. Charnocke* in his answer to the Cardinall sheweth, howe that their decree was such) and also that a iust Appellation such, as *M. Charnocke* doeth there prooue this to be in the opinions of *Innocentius*, *Hosienfis*, *Geminianus*, *S. Antonin*, *Coberrubias*, *Siluester*, *Angelus*, *Nauar*, and others, may take away the force of a decree, that it doe no way binde, vntill the cause be againe iudged against the Appellant: But this fellow speaketh according to his skill, when he telleth the Reader, that the two priests were bound vnder mortall sinne, to accept and fulfill that sentence, which the Cardinall gaue concerning the oth. There is enough said, although also it may be added, that there are certaine in all countreys, who haue very large faculties, as this author knoweth well, who can vpon cause dispence with an oath extorted wrongfully, by a greater person then *M. Acharisius* is, and by the suggestion of an honest man then *F. Parsons* is, and the partie inueighed may with greater securitie receiue the absolution. And vpon occasion giuen him to speake of the oath, as the Cardinall did here giue *M. Charnocke*, he may say without any bragging, that he did delude the deceit which was used by such coufening companions as would exact an oth where they had no commission. But neither was any oth exacted at all for the performance of this sentence, and this author sheweth himselfe a notorious impostor in false translating those wordes, *quantities*, &c. Here hath this author set downe the decree of the two Card. to the performance whereof he challengeth an oath made by the priests, which he saith was as cleare & resolute, as might be set downe in these wordes, *Quapropter prefatis Gulielmo & Roberto sacerdotibus, &c. Vberius* both in his Holinesse and our names, we doe ordaine unto the foresaid William and Robert priests, and doe command them strictly in the vertue of holy obedience, vnder the paine of suspension from holy orders and exercise of the same, to be incurred by the fact it selfe, and vnder other censures and punishments, to be inflicted at the iudgement of his Holinesse, that none of them without expresse licence of his Holinesse, or Cardinall



called before he came to us. For in these letters the Commission is given to the Rector or Vicerector of the College, to signifie unto us, as prisoners in the College, in your names what we were to doe. And so doth *M. Charnocke* proceede, answering euery part and parcell in the Cardinals letters, and shewing out of the most approved Canonistes, that his fact was lawfull, and that he incurred no censures, by returning into his Countrey, after his Appeale made in *Lorraine*. And by this it is made manifest, what the deceit was, and whose, which *M. Charnocke* telleth the Cardinall he did delude, and the cauels are also answered, which are here made in the *Apologie*, where this authour would aske: who could absolue from an oath exhibited by the immediate Commissary, or Delegate of his Holinesse? For to this is answered, that if the immediate Commissary, or Delegate of his Holinesse aske an oath, beyond his Commission, any man may absolue from it. But neither was here any immediate Commissary, nor Delegate of his Holinesse, but a fellowe suborned (as it should seeme) by *F. Parsons* to come doe some acte at his request. For *M. Scarisius* seeming to read what he proposed, as sent to the Colledge by the two Cardinals, had not his lesson so perfect, as *Fa. Parsons* had it without the booke. And vpon *Fa. Parsons* after-speech, *M. Scarisius* repeated his lesson, and thrust in this deuise, that the priests should sweare not to goe into England without leaue, whereas before there was onely a censure of suspension to be incurred, if they did retorne without leaue, which censure also, as *M. Charnocke* dooth demonstrate in his answere to the Cardinall, was suspended by his Appeale. But this matter is more aggrauated yet against *M. Charnocke* for that the sentence was such, as otherwise they were bound to accept, and fulfill vnder paine of deadly sinne, that is to say, they were bound to goe begge or starue in some one place or other, out of their countrey, vnlesse this fellowe can perswade his Reader, that they had some allowance for their maintenance, to which if any man had bene compelled to binde himselfe by oath, I would aske any indifferent man, whether there could be *maioris iniquitatis vinculum*, a bond of greater iniquitie, especially if the Iurors were neuer conuicted of any crime (as their case was) which bond all learned men doe say, is no bond. And if this  
poore



poore companion his opinion (that euery decree did binde vnder deadly sinne) were receiued, all the Canonists must goe for egregious fooles, who affirme both that some decrees are *ipso iure*, of no force (and *M. Charnocke* in his answer to the Cardinall sheweth, howe that their decree was such) and also that a iust Appellation such, as *M. Charnocke* doeth there prooue this to be in the opinions of *Innocentius*, *Hosienfis*, *Geminianus*, *S. Antonin*, *Coberrubias*, *Siluester*, *Angelus*, *Nauar*, and others, may take away the force of a decree, that it doe no way binde, vntill the cause be againe iudged against the Appellant: But this fellow speaketh according to his skill, when he telleth the Reader, that the two priests were bound vnder mortall sinne, to accept and fulfill that sentence, which the Cardinall gaue concerning the oth. There is enough said, although also it may be added, that there are certaine in all countreys, who haue very large faculties, as this author knoweth well, who can vpon cause dispence with an oath extorted wrongfully, by a greater person then *M. Aclarisus* is, and by the suggestion of an honest man then *F. Parsons* is, and the partie inueighed may with greater securitie receiue the absolution. And vpon occasion giuen him to speake of the oath, as the Cardinall did here giue *M. Charnocke*, he may say without any bragging, that he did delude the deceit which was used by such coufening companions as would exact an oath where they had no commission. But neither was any oath exacted at all for the performance of this sentence, and this author sheweth himselfe a notorious impostor in false translating those wordes, *quasi sic*, &c. Here hath this author set downe the decree of the two Card. to the performance whereof he challengeth an oath made by the priests, which he saith was as cleare & resolute, as might be set downe in these wordes, *Quapropter prefatis Gulielmo & Roberto sacerdotibus, &c. Vherefore both in his Holinesse and our names, we doe ordaine unto the foresaid William and Robert priests, and doe command them strictly in the vertue of holy obedience, vnder the paine of suspension from holy orders and exercise of the same to be incurred by the fact it selfe, and vnder other censures and punishments, to be inflicted at the iudgement of his Holinesse, that none of them without expresse licence of his Holinesse, or Cardinall*



nall Protector, doe presume to goe to any of the kingdomes of England, Scotland, or Ireland for the time, &c. This &c. cutteth off the principall point, which would here make against this authour, for in that which followeth, it is evident, that not M. *Acarisius*, but the Rector or Vicerector of the English Colledge, were appointed by the two Cardinals, to deliuer their commandement vnto the two priests, and consequently what was before done by *Segnior Acarisius*, to haue beene some iugling of Fa. *Parsons*: for that it followeth in the decree, or letter rather, as also it is confessed in his *Apologie*, fol. 139. *Sed apud alios, &c. Hocq; nostro nomine Reuerentia vestra eis significet. But live in other countreys, &c. And this doe your Reuerence signifie vnto them in our name.* And if any man should doubt, whose reuerence it was, who was to deliuer the Card. mind vnto the two priests, they may put themselues out of doubt, by looking vpon this inscription, *Reuerendo in Christo Patri Rectori vel Vicerectori Collegij Anglorum de urbe: To the Reuerend Father Rector or Vicerector of the English Colledge in Rome.* But this and the latter part of the letter was left out, that the Reader might conceiue how that the priests had sworne to obserue, or fulfill this decree, and that this oth was exhibited by the immediat Commissarie or Delegate of his Holinesse, whereas this letter appeared not in many dayes after that M. *Acarisius* the Commissarie came vnto the Colledge vpon a sleeuelesse errand, as by this decree it appeareth, although it beare a date of the day before M. *Acarisius* came thither, to wit, 21. April, and M. *Acarisius* came not vntill the 22. of the same. And this was then vsed as an argument by Fa. *Parsons*, that M. *Acarisius* should not haue come, insomuch as hee seemed to be somewhat amazed (as I vnderstand) when hee shewed this letter to M. *Charnocke*, what the reason might be that *Acarisius* did take vpon him to declare the Cardinals sentence, seeing the Cardinals had committed the matter to others, as appeared by those letters. And Fa. *Parsons* being asked by M. *Charnocke*, what should be the reason, that these letters bearing date the 21. of April, were not seene in so many dayes after? answered, that they were brought vnto the Colledge the 21. of April, which was the day before M. *Acarisius* came thither, but were left in his chamber the same day,

and



and that hee had newly found them, when he brought them to M. Charnocke. M. Bishop was now at libertie, and had ben some dayes before, and had not seene this sentence of the two Cardinals; neither was it ever shewed him otherwise, then thus: Comming one day to see F. Parsons, or M. Charn. who was kept stil as yet in prison, F. Parsons told him, that there lay a letter vpon the table for him to looke on, which when M. Bishop had read, he layd it downe againe, and neuer was any motion made to one, or other for any othe; for the fulfilling of this sentence of the Cardinals, which was their sentence, and no other, as is confessed in this *Apologie* fol. 139. and is onely vrged in this place to haue bin transgressed with perjurie: for so still doth this author goe forward. *This was the decree* (sayth he) *and it is strange that any Catholike priest would aduenture, to breake it so openly, and to glory in it by writing, when he had done.* This man is vilely troubled that M. Charnocke did nothing but for what he was able to giue his reason, and such as when he commeth to answer, he letteth all slip quietly. Yet he wil here haue a saying vnto him, and tell his reader that M. Charnocke did *glory in the breaking of the decree*; which is most false: for neither did he breake the decree, but appealed in forme of Lawe from the iniquitie thereof, nor glory therein, but proued the iustnesse of his appeale out of most approved authors, as may be scene in his answer to Cardinall Burghese set in the booke to the *Inquisition* pag. 87. *But what?* (saith he) *did he attend to obserue the other parts of the decree, more then this; which was that they should liue quietly and obediently, and to procure others also to peace, and concord?* I answer, that I vnderstood by such as lined in *Lorraine*, that he liued very quietly, and brought with him a testimony of the same from M. *Arthur Piss*, to whom he was so much beholding, as to liue in his house, vntill his breaking vp house caused M. Charnocke to returne into his countrey: and hee liued obediently to all his Superiours. And in this very Chapter there will be a sufficient testimonie gathered out of the 144. leaf, that he procured peace, and concord in such a loued peace. And as for the others, it was neither in his power to procure it (being banished so farre off from them) neither could any man in wisdom doe it for him vnto it. But this author will prooue the contrary:



ry: but how, trow ye? Forsooth by the effects that ensued his going in. As how? *For within fourteene dayes after this his letter to the Cardinall, there followed their greatest appeale from the Archpriest. A great matter against M. Charnocke.* Might he not as well haue sayd, that it was about a moneth after that Cardinall *Burghesius* letter came into England to M. Charnocke, and haue layd the blame (if appealing deserued blame) vpon the Cardinall? If any man will take the paines to looke vpon the causes of the Appeale set downe in English in Ma. Colingtons booke pag. 192. to the 202 page, he shall finde as much reason for the one as for the other, and that the grieuances were most intollerable which were offered them, long before M. Charn. returne into England, and were the principall causes of their Appeale. But lest that all, euen his blindest fooles, should find him to be a poore cauiller in this cause against M. Charnocke, he will tell them another coniecture, and that is, that M. Charn. sought occasion to quarrell with the Archpriest vpon his first entertainment into England. And for prooffe hereof he citeth a piece of a letter, which M. Charnocke writ vnto him 24. May 1600, of which letter I will set some part downe, according to the copie thereof, as I haue seene it: *Right Reuerend Sir, being returned into England, I thought it my duety in most humble maner, to salute you, hoping my returne cannot be preiudiciall to any your good courses, and desiring for your further satisfaction, to speake with you, when it shall please you. This which followeth is inserted here in the Apologie. In the meane while to request of you thus much in charitie, to write to me, why sending for me to declare the authority giuen you by Cardinal Caietane his letters, you shewed me such instructions as when I came to Rome, I found were not annexed to your Commission, as you at that time sayd were annexed. Thus far in the Apologie, and then toward the latter end: Reuerend Sir, a small reason from you shall giue me satisfaction: for mine intention is not to argue any matters with you, but to take your answer simply, as you shall giue it, and rest therein satisfied. And this scruple being removed, I shall the more confidently deale with you in other matters which I am to impart vnto you. Thus wishing nothing more then peace and quietnesse amongst vs, I cease to trouble you from your charitable affaires, and doe expect some answer from you at your best leisure.*



sure. 24. of May. But of this hath this *Apologie*-maker culled as much as is here noted: which part if it were taken alone by it selfe, could not imply a quarrel in any honest mans iudgement, much lesse when it is taken with all these circumstances. But this author must either adde somewhat still to that which he citeth, or curtall it: or els he wil shame himselfe. And as for that which M. *Charnocke* affirmed in his letter, it is confirmed by another, although the Archpriests secretary gaue M. *Charnocke* the lie five or sixe times in the answer to his letter, which how well soeuer it fitteth with the new religious managing of matters, did not so well become a priest to a priest: neither hath M. *Charnocke* so behaued himselfe, but that his credit alone without any other witnesse may be thought as good as M. *Blackwels*, or this idle authors, although he doth not enuie their worships calling. But marke I pray you how this matter would be here salued. *The Archpriest denieth that euer hee sayd, that they (the fained instructions) were expressely in his instructions from Rome.* By which it may be gathered, that the Archpriest did at the least propose such matters, as were not in his instructions, which were sent from Rome. But this is not the matter wherewith he is charged, that he should vse these particular words: but hee is charged directly, that pretending to shewe the instructions which were annexed to his Commission, hee shewed such as were not annexed thereunto. And being taken in the manner he confessed as much. And who seeth not what a poore shift this is, *the Archpriest denieth that he sayd they were expressely in his instructions?* who doubteth but that the man saith truth, when answering his neighbor who calleth for him vseth these words, *I say, I am not at home*, although he be at home? For although it be false that he is not at home, yet it is very true that he sayth hee is not at home. And with this iest doth this fellow salue this matter; *the Archpriest denieth that hee sayd that they were expressely in his instructions.* Who euer charged him that he should vse these words? These poore shifts may blinde such as willingly will be blinde, and other men will soone discouer the fallacy. The accusation was and is, that pretending to shew his instructions, which his Commission mentioned, to be annexed vnto it, hee drew out false things, which were neuer annexed to his com-



mission: and he was taken in the maner. And this is it which both M. Charnocke and M. Colington will iustifie, & many more such goodly matters, if need shall require, where these poore trickes wil not serue to any purpose, *I say not thus or thus expresly.* Now follow certaine exceptions against some letters written by certaine priests in *Wibich* vnto the Archpriest. I haue not leene the copies to my remembrance, and therefore can say nothing of them more then this, that it is not incredible, that the Archpriest would giue cause of sharper words then are there vsed. But all serueth to prooue somewhat, namely, *what course was held by the troublesome, especially after M. Charnockes returne into England.* But there is not one worde, what the masters of misrule did before M. Charnock returned into England, or what cause they did giue of these troubles, to wit, the raising of the slander of *schisme*, and such vile imputations, as the prisoners might accordingly haue written to the Archpriest in other termes, then *peripsema tuum*. There must not be a word of this matter which made all the stirre: for sayth this fellow with shame enough (*ca. 8 fol. 115.*) *of the other point of schisme we will not talke at all, and wee are sory that euer it was mentioned or brought in question: vnquiet people hauing taken occasion hereby to continue contention, and to make more brables then were needfull.* How easie a matter had it been then for this author to haue solved this question proposed in this tenth chapter *fol 148.* Which part hath broken the peace, since that he doth acknowledge, that the bringing of *schisme* in question was the cause of this contention, and could not be ignorant, who brought it againe in question, being tolde so often that the Iesuites did it; and the Archpriest both before and after the peace was made, and the Archpriest his letter was cited for prooffe thereof in the booke to his Holines pag. 63, and in the booke to the *Inquisition* pag. 60? But this author must haue his Readers eares filled with other stories, such as are impertinent to his question. And when he thinketh that his Reader hath forgotten the matter which he proposed: then he slinketh away, and beginneth afresh with some other which he handleth as wisely.

But to make an end of this Chapter: here are certaine letters inserted of *F. Parsons* exhorting to peace, as though *F. Parsons*



*sons* tricks were not knowne very well. If this author could haue brought forth any of *F. Parsons* letters to his fellow *F. Lyster*, or *F. Garnet*, or *F. Jones* the Iesuits, who were the chiefe maintainers of that senselesse Libel of *schisme* against the priests, to perswade them to retract their scandalous opinions, to correct their forwardnesse in iniuring Catholique priests, to exhort them to make satisfaction for their vnchristian detractions: such letters would haue bene for *F. Parsons* credit. But to cite a letter, or exhortation to the priests iniured, to haue peace: what doeth it argue but an obdurate malice in him, and a wicked desire, that they should desist from that, to which they were bound in conscience, to wit, the defence of their fame, and the clearing themselves from such false, but most wicked impostures of *schisme*, rebellion, and whatsoeuer a mischicuous head could deuise, and spread abroad against them?

*And so finally* (saith this author) *after all their former resistance, and appeales as well of D. Bagshaw and his fellows at Wisbich, as of M. Charnocke and other abroad, they ioyned in greater number vpon the 17. of Nouember last, if all consented thereunto, whose names are subscribed, whereof we heare the contrary in some* (some one or two, who had giuen their consents in generall, but had not seene this particuler appeale, yet afterward confirmed it, and appealed againe, for so much, as there was any need.) *In all which doing of theirs one thing is especially to be noted, And what is that? That they haue neuer procured any one of all their appeales to be presented hitherto, or prosecuted in Rome as farre as we can understand,* (this last clause wil not helpe, if the proposition be generall of all the appeales: For *M. Charnocks* appeale was presented and prosecuted in Rome, before this booke came forth: and this author could not be ignorant thereof, if I am not mistaken in him) *which yet they ought to haue done within certaine moneths, vnder paine that all is voyd if it be not done.* But how many are these certaine moneths? The Lawyers say 13. moneths, if we shall count them by the moneths: and vpon iust cause 26. moneths from the Appeale, within which time doubtlesse the author of this *Apologie*, heard of the Appellants at Rome. And *Launcelot l. 4. Instit. Iuris Canon. de appellationibus cap. accidit.* affirmeth, Yet a longer time might haue bene granted for the



prosecution of an Appeale: But as I thinke no man doeth now doubt, but that the priests had intention to follow their Appeale, and will giue this cause of their publishing of books, *pendente lite*, that is, *while the controuersies hang*: for that the Arch-priest (notwithstanding their Appeale) denounced them to haue incurred the censures, & lost their faculties, because they subscribed to a thing called *an Appeale*, & he kept a fowle stirre by some of his seditious Agents against the Appellants. Another reason was, because they had a desire that their cause should be knowen sufficiently abroad, which could not bee knowen too much in their conceit, who sought nothing but a trial of the trueth, and for iustice against their vniust defamers. But what this author hath to say against these bookes, you shal heare in the next Chapter: and if you wil haue an answer from him to this question proposed *fol. 148. which part hath broken the peace*, you must goe picke it vp where you can, now you know his worships minde.

### C H A P. 16.

*How the two bookes against which the Apologie is written, are sleightly runne ouer with a few cauils against them.*  
Apol. cap. 11.

**I**N the eleuenth Chapter the author of the *Apologie* intendeth to shew, how false, slanderous, and iniurious the two bookes are which the Priests set forth; whereof one was in Latine to his Holinesse, the other in English, entituled, *The Copies of certaine Discourses*. He will also shew how highly the writers and publishers offended God, and all good men thereby. Lastly, he will defend certaine particular men, that are slandered therein. And first he beginneth to shew, how God was offended, supposing still, that credite must be giuen vnto him in all which he sayth, *Now (sayth he fol. 160.) are we come (gentle Reader) almost to the last, but the most loathsome part of all our answer, which is to handle and examine in particular, the two contumelious libels, &c.* And after a holy protestation against so  
base



*base and wicked a spirit*, neuer so much perchance as imagined, that it should be so manifest in himselfe, doth here, and since in his *Manifestation of spirits*, and a certaine Latine libell, entituled, *Appendix, &c.* he telleth his gentle Reader, that the sinne of libelling is to be considered, *how grieuous it is in the sight of God, how great censures are layd thereon, &c.* O how would this man make a saint with a little helpe? but his gentle Reader demaundeth of him, where all these considerations were, when the Iesuits writ their discourse, *aduersus factiosos in Ecclesia: against the factious in the Church*: where were these considerations, when this libell was generally approoued by their fellow Iesuits, the Archpriest, and all that seditious crew, which adhered vnto them in this sinnefull acte, whereby many Catholicke priests were most maliciously, and most vniustly defamed, and (to omit other most malapert and scornefull speeches) were in spirit exclaimed against in this sort, *Vos rebelles estis, &c. Yee are rebels, ye are schismatickes and fallen out of the Church the spouse of Christ, you haue trampled vnder your feete the obedience which is due to the sea Apostolicke, yee haue rushed into excommunication and irregularitie, ye haue so scandalized the godly that ye are euery where infamous, ye haue by disobedience sinned against the chiefe Vicar of Christ, and against Christ himselfe the Iudge and Iusticer. See, I pray you, how that ye are nothing better then Southsayers and Idolaters, and as Ethnicks & Publicans, because you obeyed not the Church when it spake vnto you by the highest Bishop.* And all this sturre was, because the prielts did not accept of the new authoritie vpon the sight of a letter written by one that was neither the highest Bishop, nor the lowest, nor yet any Bishop at all, nor of any such credit, as he was to be beleued in this matter, as hath beene sufficiently prooued by M. Doctor *Ely* in his notes vpon the *Apologie*, and M. *Collington* in his defence of the slandered priests, and was diuersly touched before in other their bookes. But where were these godly considerations, when this libell, so senselesse, false, and scandalous, was written and published? how was God offended hereby, or was hee not in your pious wisdom? were any censures incurred hereby of the Church, or any punishments deserued which the ciuill lawe inflicteth vpon Libellers? In whom was that *base and wicked spirit*, against



which you so godly inueigh in this place, when Iesuites, the Archpriest, and their faction were authours, spreaders, or approouers of such things? where were these godly meditations, when the Archpriest after the peace made did spread and approoue that scandalous libell, or *resolution* (as hee termed it) from the *mother citie*, that the refusers of the appointed authoritie, were *scismaticks*? I will omit to speake of that *base and wicked spirit*, which caried certain gentlemen from house to house (as he doeth the mountebanks from towne to towne) with certaine libels against particular men, where they seeme to strue whether they can excell those mountebanks in shamelesse and vngracious relations. I will here say nothing of that *base and wicked spirit*, which maketh euery one of the factious adherents to the Iesuits and Archpriest, a most infamous and scandalous Libeller against such priests, as did delay to accept of the Archpr. before they saw iust cause, and denyed afterward that they had bene *schismatickes* during the time of that delay. I will not vrge this fellow his *Manifestation of spirits*, in which all his holines (which he pretendeth many other wayes) is discovered to be nothing but hypocrisie. I will onely stand vpon this *Apologie*, in which I haue shewed, and shall yet discover so many falshoods and slanders, as no man of indifferencie can deny, but that it is a most *notorious libell*, and proceeded of a most *base and wicked spirit*. And so I will leaue it to the authour his own iudgement here giuen, *what sinne it is to libell, how grievous in the sight of God and man, and how great censures and extreame punishments are due vnto him for it*, when hee shall come to his answer, as the priests haue bene in the face of the whole world: which in the opinion of all learned men, hath freed their bookes from the ignominious name of libels.

But here are certaine circumstances, which aggrauate the matter against the priests: as first, that *a religious communitie is here defamed*: but this is false, for the societie is not touched by the priests, but certaine men of the society, such as we hope the whole society will not beare out in their wicked courses. And if they should beare them out therein, and thereby make themselves a party, then must the *religious community* expect no other priuiledge, then any other irreligious company. And  
I can-



I cannot but marueile, how M.D. *Ely* in this Epistle to M.D. *W.* (prefixed to his notes vpon the *Apologie*) b'lameth the Priests for opposing themselues (as he mistaketh them) against the whole society: for they haue not in all their bookes vsed any such generall termes, as may include the whole bodie of the societie when they haue spoken of Iesuits: but in handling particular matters haue sufficiently discovered whom they haue ment, when they haue spoken of Iesuits, yea they haue in plain termes, and particularly affirmed, and published in print, that they doe not touch the body of the societie, but some particular men, as may be seene in their preface to the booke dedicated to the *Inquisition*, pag 5. where they make this protestation, *Neque quæ de societate hîc dicuntur, in vniuersam societatem dicta velimus, cui tantum tribuimus quantũ eius virtus, & doctrina postulant, hic tantum particulares quorundam actiones conquerimur, &c.* Neither will we, that what is said here of the society, be said of the whole society, to which we doe attribute as much as their vertue and learning deserue, we doe complaine here of the particular actions of some onely, &c. And as it should seeme, this matter troubleth the authour of this *Apologie* much more, as it is against a fewe Iesuits, then as it is against all the rest, which causeth himselfe still to forget himselfe, or his matter rather, when any occasion occurreth as it doth often to speake of the Iesuits; and here he runneth along after them with these admirations, *what manner of people they bee for diuers respects, that are here discovered*, although they were not the same men, which are here discovered: *and of what account with our very enemies themselves*, of what other then hypocrites, matchiulians and traitors to their Countrey? *some of them being Superiours* (as euery parish in London hath scholemasters, yea and some in hier offices) *some of singular merit towards the common cause*, such cause perhaps, as to which the infamie of Catholike priests must bee iudged most necessary: *others notorious for their knowen vertues*, how gladly would *blind Hugh* see some of them here in England, for then, neither should the good haue cause to grieue, nor the bad bee conformed in their naughty course, who seeing the supposed best to be so bad, they doe rashly coniecture, that there is none good, for which folly of theirs, they and their  
bad



bad guides must answer at the last day, and smart long before, vnlesse they repent themselves while they haue time to repent. Thus much concerning this authours conceite of the sinne of libelling retorted vpon himselfe and his partners in this *Apolo-*  
*logie*, and other his Libels, which he will neuer be able to iusti-  
 fie. Now follow his exceptions against the two bookes, which  
 he termeth Libels; wherein he purposeth to discover *foule faults*  
 to haue bene, as *falsehood, deceite, malice and slanderous calumnia-*  
*tions*. Alwayes prouided, that whereas the Reader hath still  
 expected, and liued in hope to see somewhat to the purpose,  
 now he must take this colde comfort to be remitted backe to  
 the Chapters before handled for a larger prooffe of what is to  
 be sayd. First hee beginneth with the latine booke, which is  
 dedicated to his Holinesse, whose title is, *Declaratio motuum,*  
*&c. A declaration of the sturres and troubles that haue risen in*  
*England betweene the Iesuits on the one side, together with M. G.*  
*Blackwel Archpriest in all things fauouring them, and the Semina-*  
*ry Priests on the other side, from the death of Cardinall Allen of pious*  
*memory, vnto this yeere 1601. In this very title (saith he) and first*  
*page 5. or 6. abuses and sleights and shifts may be noted to be vsed to-*  
*wards his Holinesse &c. for first whereas the whole world knoweth,*  
*that their controuersie is with the Archpriest as appeareth by their*  
*Appellation to his Holines, an. 1600. 17. Nouemb. and others be-*  
*fore, and that their stomacke against the Iesuits is for standing with*  
*him, and for as by the whole discourse of both these bookes appeareth,*  
*here they change the whole controuersie, and do say, that it is with the*  
*Iesuits and M. Blackwell, that fauoureth them so as he is put here,*  
*but as an Appendix in the cause which is plaine falsehood.*

This is the first fault which is found in the Latin booke: & all  
 things considered, it wil not proue a *fault*, much lesse so *foule* as  
 this author would it should seeme to be: the appellation was  
 made from the Archp. & not from the Iesuits, because appella-  
 tions are made from such only, as are and take vpon them to be  
 superiors. Such are not the Iesuits ouer the Secular priests, nei-  
 ther doeth the appealing from the Archpr. cleare the Iesuits,  
 who in the appellation it selfe are proued to be the chiefe foun-  
 taines of all these broyles, as all the world may see in the Ap-  
 peale. And he doeth very falsly affirme that the whole dis-  
 course



course sheweth no other, as himselfe can remember, when he listeth: Namely in his table prefixed to his *Apologie num. 23.* where he citeth this sentence out of his *Latine booke pag. 30. Iesuita &c. The Iesuits dispaireing to be able to get superioritie to themselves by way of voyces or suffrages ( of the priests ) and on the other side hating and flying to admit episcopall dignitie (into England) thought to procure dominion to themselves vnder the maske of an other mans person, &c.* Hath this fellow now forgotten what his owne iudgement was there of the priests their conceit of this matter? hath not he perswaded his reader, that the principall and onely ground of this our present contention, and scandalous controuersie, is the very same disease of *emulation* partly of Lay men against priests, and partly of priests against religious men, *especially the Fathers of the Societie, with whom at this present they haue to doe? Apol. cap. 1. fol. 2.* And would he now haue his reader belecue, that the whole world knoweth the contrary, and that it is not principally against the Iesuits? And whereas it is here said that the Archpr. is put as an *Appendix*, some indeed doe thinke, that he hath bound himselfe Apprentice to the Iesuits: but I doe not heare that the priests do talke of th'one or th'other.

The second *foule fault* which here is found is, that the priests of the Seminaries residing in England, are put for the opposite part, of which, saith he, *these contentions are not the twentieth part, and this is proued by their owne confessions, in the former chapter.* Perchance this fellow hath relation to the question made to *M. Bishop, and M. Charnocke, How many they did certainly know to approue this their mission, and to be priuie to the matters, that should be proposed, &c. Chap 9. Apol. 131.* To which these priests made their answer according to their owne certaine knowledge, which answer is there deceitfully inserted, as hath bene shewed, and is here as deceitfully againe brought by him for his purpose, their confessions being, that there were *Quàm plures sacerdotes, Very many priests*, as appeareth where *M. Charnocks* examination is set downe *fol. 130*, which he there proued by certaine letters, which he brought with him, which testified as much. And by their answer of their certaine knowledge, which they could not haue, but by present or particuler letter: this



fellow taketh a silly aduantage to proue that they were not the 20. part by their owne confession. The priests did call themselves priests of the Seminaries, because they were so, and by this name are distinguished from the Iesuits, who are the principall faction against them, and are priests, who sooner or later for the most part did forsake the Seminaries.

*Thirdly, they say in this title (saith he) that their contentions against the Iesuits began from the death of Card. Allen.* They neither challenge vnto themselves any cōtentions against the Iesuits, neither doe they say when any begun, but onely intituled the booke in this maner, *A declaration of stirres and troubles which are or were betweene the Iesuits and them, since the death of the Cardinall, vnto such a yeere.* If a man should write of the warres in the Low Countreys from the death of the Prince of Parma, vntill this present yeere, must he be said to affirme, that the warres began then? yet cannot this author proue, that there was any publique opposition, or common stirres in England before the Cardinals death: but that rather what was begunne, (as he saith *Cap. 2. fol. 85.* in the Cardinals time by Libertines, and factious people,) was retained somewhat from breaking forth by his authority while he liued, and this is most true: for the Iesuits who lusted after a superioritie ouer the priests, were afraid to make this their pride knowen, either by themselves, or by their factious adherents, so long as he liued; But the good Cardinall being dead in the yeere 94, all factious brake out together; *Fa. Weston* the Iesuit, and his factions begun a common wealth in *Wisbich*, and vnder a colour of a stricter rule, all the priests there must become his subiects, or liue in perpetuall infamie, some Iesuits abroad tooke order for the priests their welcome to all such places, whither they were not directed by them. The matters of Rome I leaue to them to whom that belongeth, and although this fellow is so impudent, as to alledge the Cardinall *Allen* his letter to proue that some of the seditious (as he termeth them) had begunne to stirre against the Fathers in England in his dayes, his reader may easily discouer his falshood if he will turne (not to the place by him cited, to wit, the 4. Chapter, for there is nothing to be scene) but to the second Chapter, for there he shall finde that the priests are no  
more



more charged for any stirre against the Iesuits, then the Iesuits for their sedition against the priests, and moreouer that what difference there was, could not be but some priuate quarrels betweene some priuate man, and not any such publique difference or dislike, as this is of which the booke intreated which was dedicated to his Holines, as I haue shewed where this letter is set downe by this author.

*Fourthly they said, Ad S. D. N. Clementem 8. exhibita ab ipsis sacerdotibus, that this declaration was exhibited by the Priests themselves to our most holy father Pope Clement the 8.* This word was is of his owne addition. It is said to be exhibited, in that it was presently to be sent by them; And if it came not to his Holines his hands so soone as they intended, the fault was not in them who tooke all such meanes for it as they could, so that they might iustly vse the phrase, which they did, without deseruing any blame therefore. And the priests are saide to exhibite it themselves, for that they writ it, and were to present it in their owne names, and the not comming of it to his Holines view will iustifie their printing of many copies, that some one, by one or other, might come into his hands, and the shamelesnes of this fellow may the more now appeare, who would so peremptorily informe his reader, that the priests were loth, that he should know of it (hauing by printing taken a most certaine way for it) and much lother to answere it before him, before whom the whole world will witnes for them, that they haue bene to answere it. The fifth cauill is at the sentence of Scripture, which the priests put to their books, as though they had abused it in vsing it in that place; But gald nagges must haue pardon, if being touched they winch. The iustnesse of the priests their cause, will beare them out against all hereticks, hypocrits, and Atheists, and will stop the mouthes of them, how potent soeuer they either are, or would seeme to be among their like. Thus much is implied in that sentence, and no lesse was in the priests their meaning when they prefixed it to their Booke.

*Sixtly and lastly it is said in this first page (sayth he) that it was printed Rhotomagi apud Iacobum, &c. At Roane in France in the house of Iames, &c.* And hereupon he keepeth such a foule stirre,



as if it had beene a whole halfe penny matter, where the booke had bene printed, or that the Pope might haue thought the priests cause to be the more iust, if the booke were printed at Roane. I pray you good sir tell me, what doeth the being here or there printed, helpe or hinder the matter in questiō? what if it be printed at *Constantinople* or at *Cosmop*? If this fellow could shew what auaille may come to the priests, or what preiudice to the other part, by hauing their booke goe forth as printed at *Roane*, he might haue bestowed a little of his paines, taken here about it, to some good purpose: but his exception beeing so absurd as it is, I will turne him to the Printers boy to reason this matter with him, who, for any thing that I can as yet learne, set this (which he citeth) to the booke, and the boy finding this fellow some equall match for him, will perchance spurre him this question, Why he should conster *Rhotomagi*, Printed at *Roane*, rather then to be folde at *Roane*; or why hee should interpret *Rhotomagi*, at *Roane in France*, rather then at *Roane in England*, there being in England diuers places named by as strange names as *Roane* is, as *Scotland*, *Iury*, *little Britaine*, and such like; yea the little boy will remember perchance that some of *F. P.* bookes, which were printed here in England, are said to haue bene printed at *Doway*, and yet I trow this author will not say for a hundred pound, that *F. P.* can lye, or at the least, that hee abused any man in saying so. But I will leaue this authour and the Printers boy together, for they seeme to be very well coupled to argue this matter: onely I wish, that this author would beware, what termes he doeth vse in his anger: for it may be, the Printer will call him twice or thrice by his name, if he be miscalled himselfe, or perchance the Printer or his boy will tell him, that there are as good Printers in London as in *Roane*, although they themselues were not so expert, and put him to a *nonplus*, for saying, that the booke was printed vnder the protection of my L. of London.

*Well then (sayth hee) these sixe absurdities, shifts, and falshoods, being discovered in the very first page of the booke, as a preamble to the rest, and used euen to his Holines himselfe, we may imagine what the remnant will be.* The reader may imagine, that it is not worth the stooping for, which this man letteth lye, if it be not too  
hot,



hot, or too heavy for him, as here also he excepteth against the priests their printing of their bookes: *notwithstanding the scandall which may grow by the comming abroad of these dissensions:* to which, answer is made, that they must looke to it, who driue the priests to this course, hauing no other way left for them to recouer their fame, which was most iniuriously taken away from them. Hee excepteth also against that which is said of Card. Allen his fauour towards the priests, which hee sayth *he hath refuted in the third and fourth Chapter*, in which this author hath committed (as often he doeth in this kinde) a more grosse fault, then if he had said, that his booke had beene printed at *Roane in France*: for this would haue troubled none, but some cauilling foole: and these trickes to referre his reader so often to such places, where he shall find nothing of that matter for which he is sent hither, may trouble euen his *gentle readers* patience. Well yet you must goe looke in the third Chapter for a matter, which is not there touched by him: there is in the fourth Chapter some prooffe, that the Cardinal disliked some actions, in which were some temporall men, and some priests, long agoe, many yeeres before these stirres began, which belong nothing to the controuersie now in question, which is, *whether the priests were schismatickes*, who deferred to accept the Archpr. before they did see the *Breue*, or to these priuat quarrels, of which it seemeth (by a letter of his set in the second Chapter) he was informed before his death: or thirdly to the stirres which the Iesuits began in the Colledge about the same time. To conclude, there is nothing recited there, which is here affirmed; neither is that which is laid to Fa. Heywood his chalenging of *legantine* power in England any way solued, but in this manner: *and this is all the difference, that euer was betweene F. Heywood and F. Parsons*: as if the question had beene, which is the way to Poplington? yea there is as much confessed, as F. Heywood was charged with for the particulars, as any man may see in this 164. lease. The readers must go looke here and there for diuers other matters: but D. Haddocke and M. Martin Array are here to be defended by the author, for that poore resistance which they made vnto the two priests. Indeede these good Proctors came vnto the two priests within two dayes, or



three of their arriual at Rome, and were so hote with them, as *M. Martin Array* stirred not out of his chamber aboue a fortnight after: he had bene all that while possessed with an ague, which some of his friends said, that hee had before hee tooke that heate, but a suddden ioy perchance, that the two priests were that day to be apprehended, put life and health into him vpon the feast day of *S. Tho. of Canterbury*, and made him come abroad: and what these Proctors did after, at the apparance of the two priests, I haue before shevved, and vvhath *M. Martin* vvrit into England thereof.

The particulars which touch these Proctors their persons I know not, and therefore I leaue it vnto them to declare, who thought it expedient to make them know in this cause: yet doe I not well vnderstand, how there was *any affinitie* between Cardinal *Allen* and *D. Haddocke* (which this fellow will needes haue for the Doctors credit) neither of them hauing bene at any time married, and I haue heard that *M. Martin Array* was extraordinarily fauoured by Sir *Francis Walsingham*, by whom he was admonished to depart out of England, before some matters should chance, which would shortly chance, and would be some let to his passage: which kinde of vsage at that time, to wit, when the great trouble was in the yeere 1586. being layd together with his being then set at liberty, might giue suspition to some, that all was not as it should haue been, although in times of lesse trouble some men haue found the fauor by extraordinary meanes to haue their liberty at the intercession of some great men, or some highly fauoured friends. Now followeth his defence of *M. Standish*, and diuers other. And whereas the priests haue set downe in their bookes, that Master *Standish* had giuen his name to become a Iesuite, and therefore no fit man to deale for them in the procuring of this *subordination*, which is pretended to haue been made, to take vp controuerfies, which were between Iesuits and priests, as *cap. 8. fol. 124.* this author affirmeth, or priests and priests, and yet was the principall instrument as is wel known to all men) and it is confessed in the same chapter *fol. 98. and 99:* this author letteth that goe without any word to the contrary, for intrueth he cannot denie it, and taketh occasion to say somewhat, touching



ching that which the priests affirme of M. *Standish*, that is, that he did vse the name of the priests, as if he had been sent by the priests, whereas indeed he was not, and that he himselfe sayd at his returne (in the hearing of diuers priests, who will iustifie it) *that he had their interpretatiue consent, and that hee presumed* that they would consent to that which he did. But when this author commeth to prooue, that M. *Standish* did nothing without the priests their consent, in the procuring of this *Subordination*, he returneth his reader to the eighth Chapter for diuers priests letters, which already I haue shewed were all written after that this *Subordination* was made, which argueth a notable impudencie in this authour, that hee will so peremptorily affirme, whatsoeuer may sound any way in the eares of those, whom affection blindeth, to make for his purpose, although in the Iudgement of the indifferent hee worketh his confusion. For other disproofoe also of M. *Blackwels*, and the Cardinall *Caietans* ignorance in our English affaires, his Reader must goe backe to the eighth and ninth Chapter: he sendeth also his Reader to the third Chapter, to see how falsly the Iesuites are sayd to seeke their owne, and that they trouble the peace of England, and persecute more then heretikes. To the which it hath been answered, that they doe seeke their owne in some sort, for so much, as *pride* and what els followeth thereon, may be called theirs, and that also it might bee sayd that they seeke *qua Iesu Christi*, (as this author doth there challenge) *those things which are belonging to Iesu Christ*: for so much, as the almes of Catholikes for reliefe of priests and other Catholikes may bee saide to belong to Iesu Christ; and that they labour by infamie to seduce the Catholike Laitie from that loue, and reuerence, which they owe vnto Catholike priests, which is a persecution against the priests more grieuous, then any that hath been raised by any heretikes against them. For whereas there hath been a most charitable correspondence betweene the Catholike Laytie and the priests: now the world is come to this passe, that he is no zealous or godly Catholike, that will not runne from place to place to disgrace all such priests as refuse to be guided by the Iesuits, or in this present controuersie will not acknowledge, that they liued in *schisme*, and deserued eternall shame  
and



and reproch; because they deferred their obedience to an authoritie, vntill they did see, what was their Superiour his will concerning it: at what time they all submitted themselves vn-  
fainedly, whatsoeuer this author most wickedly suggesteth to his reader in this place, without any proofe at all, vpon certaine of his most absurd surmizes, for which also he sendeth his reader to the former chapter, where he shal see *perhaps*, and *as it is supposed*, and *it is very likely*, and such like stuffe, as a man who esteemed of his credit would be ashamed of in so weighty a matter. And for his foolish assertion, that if it had been vn-  
fained, it would haue wrought some permanent effect, there is an old saying, that there must goe two words to a bargaine, and so say I, that if there must be peace betweene two parts, both the parts must doe their parts to preserve it: for who seeth not that it is a most absurd iest, that if peace be broken by the wickednesse of the one part, the other should be blamed for not dealing sincerely, and vnfainedly? the priests haue sayd, that the Iesuits and the Archpriest did breake the peace, and they haue shewed how, and that which they haue sayd herein, cannot be controlled, and that is, that *Fa Jones* the Iesuit, after the peace made, fetched out of hell it selfe (as by the euent it appeareth) that most wicked paradox of his fellow Iesuit *Fa Lister*, concerning *schisme*, and the Archpriest also after the peace made, brake the same peace by publishing a *resolution* from the *mother citie*, that the refusers of the appointed authority were *schismatickes*, which *resolution* he affirmed he had either from *F. Warford*, or *Fa Tichborne*, a paire of yong English Iesuites, and this is the Epistle which is not onely mentioned, but set downe in the booke to his Holines pag 63, and which this author slyly ouerslippeth, and stoppeth his readers mouth with the marginal note, which is put by the priest, to wit; *origo &c. The beginning of the new contention was a violent Epistle of the Archpriests*, which here this author citeth, and runneth in his new found milde and religious tearmes vpon the priests, because they would breake out for an angry Epistle, and so laughing in his sleeue, to thinke how hee can confin the *blind obedient*, which must beleeue any thing that he telleth them, he shunneth vp this matter, without telling them what this angry Epistle was,

or



or that it was set downe in the booke to his Holinesse, least that he should haue discovered the weakenes of his cause, and consequently his owne wickednes, who in so weake a case would vse so wicked tearmes against Catholike priests.

This you see how this fellow hath answered the booke which is dedicated to his Hol. and what poore geere he picketh out, sometime out of the discourse, sometime out of the margent, and letteth this discourse goe quietly by him, and with all this nicenesse, and choice of some place, to which he might make colourable shewe of answere, he bringeth nothing, but what being examined will breede his owne shame and confusion.

The Appeale ( he saith ) shalbe answered by the Pope, who in a brieve of the 17. of *August. 1601.* refused it for peace sake, as there is said, being induced thereunto perchance by such, as were loath to heare these matters come in question: yet since this *Breue*, all the world is made a witnesse, that these matters haue bene handled at Rome, and that there was iust cause to appeale notwithstanding the fine gloses here made by this author, who wisheth perchance by this time that he had not so much commended this Pope.

Lastly he agitateth a letter of *M. Mush* his writing to *Mon Seignior Morto*, a Bishop in Italy who was ioyned with Doctor *Lewes* Bishop of *Cassana* in many affaires of the Church: which letter is said in the priests their bookes, to haue bene sent by the two messengers vnto him. And in reason the Priests ( who said so ) should haue had credit, vntill the contrary could haue bene prooued ( which can neuer be ) with more substantiall arguments, then are here brought: To wit, *it was not found among their papers*, as though they ( hauing bene 17. dayes in Rome, before that the *Iesuites* and the *Sbirri* carried them to prison ) could not conuey it ( as it was directed ) before that their papers were seized on, or secondly *the two messengers neuer spake to Fa. Parsons of such a letter, ergo* they caried no such letter with them, as though *Fa. Parsons* were the man, that must knowe all things, and was not rather kept so short, as diuers in the Citie noted, how he was troubled for that he could get no other answere of the priests to his curious question, then that *time and place* should discover what they had to say. And although af-



terward he was admitted by them to be their examiner, it was not without the condition, that they should not be bound to answer to his questions, which condition the Fiscall did take, and agree vnto, before he could obtaine of them to let *Fa. Parsons* be the examiner: and it may be thought, that when they were asked such idle questions, they did vse this license, or their owne rights, no oath in this kind binding any man to answer to all things proposed vnto them, and *Fa. Parsons* may call to minde, if it please him, that to some questions he was directly denied an answer. The matters contained in *M. Mash* his letter, are there so sufficiently handled, as this authour saith nothing thereof in this place, but referreth his reader backe to some places already handled, and answered; he glaunceth at that which is there said of the necessity of the sacrament of confirmation in England, for which all the Catholikes (if they will) may see his egerneesse against their good and comfort in this time of persecution, that he cannot heare of any who shal say it is necessary, but he is straight on his iacke for it. And because one said once that it was *either most necessary in time of persecution, or a vaine, and as a superfluous ceremony in Gods Church*, because there onely is the proper vse thereof, he playeth vpon the latter words, as if they had bene affirmed by any one, and applyeth them to such as speake for the necessitie of the sacrament. He excepteth also against that which *M. Mash* affirmeth of *Fa. Parsons* his State bookes, and is agreed, that he onely is named among such as haue written of such a subiect. And for the loue he beareth to Cardinall *Allen*, and other of our Nation, he setteth downe in print, what they haue written concerning such matters, as though their fact did excuse *Fa. Parsons* but why is *Fa. Parsons* onely named? because *Fa. Parsons* being onely aliue of those writers, of which *M. Mash* spake, was consequently more likely then any of the other to write againe of such matters, and also because *Fa. Parsons* his bookes of *Titles*, are professedly State bookes, and (being writ in fauour more of the Spanish faction, then any other) were the more likely to bring affliction vpon Catholikes, (the Spaniardes hauing given so often attempt to inuade our Countrey.) *Fa. Parsons* his dealings with the *Studentes* in Spaine



Spaine to come in those Armadoes, are euident proofes of his meaning, and consequently his bookes might be iudged most hurtfull to Catholikes. This author also would perswade his reader, that there was some great matters betweene Master *Mash* and M. *Collington*, and others, and that they were discontented either with others actions concerning the association, because they had diuers conceits for the proceeding in it: which suspicion ought to be taken away from euery indifferent man, that shall vnderstand, that they all came to a conclusion, what was fit to be done, as in all orderly proceedings it falleth out, where diuers men at the first vtter their diuers conceits. M. *Mash* is also here taxed for his letter to F. *Parsons*, which is set at the latter end of the English booke, and the matter is made very holy, that a cow should giue a good sope of milke, and kicke it downe afterward with her heeles, and so hauing commended F. *Parsons* for his writings, pertaining to deuotion, and controuersies, for which, and his good will, as I thinke, all the priests doe thanke him, as also for what other good deedes he hath done, and for reward pray to God for him to send him his grace, this author setteth himselfe to answer the English booke entituled, *The Copies of certaine discourses*, which also is here to be defended: but first this author is to be told, that he doeth ouer lash too much, when fol. 171. hee affirmeth, that neither M. *Mash* nor his fellowes haue euer written any books concerning deuotion, or controuersies, for they haue written much in both kinds, although they had not that meanes which F. *Parsons* had, to set them forth: and M. *Mash* in particular put his pen to paper against M. *Bell*, now an enemy, as now hee hath done against these factious Iesuits, which haue attempted to trouble Gods Church here in England. This author beginneth his answer to the English booke with as foolish an exception, as he tooke to the *Latine*, to wit, *that it is said to be printed at Roane*: to which the answer is already giuen, as also to that false tale deuised by him, that their bookes were printed vnder my L. of London his protection. The Meditation is as foolish, which he maketh vpon the sentence of Scripture prefixed to the English booke, *Dicet piger, &c. The slothfull excuse themselves, saying, there is a Lyon in the way*: which carrieth his



sence with it so plaine, that it needeth no such comment as this fellow maketh; it beeing well knowen, that many priests and lay men doe stand for the Iesuites and Archpriest in this their faction against the priests, which would not if they feared not the like hard measure to that, which is meated to the priests. He stumblith very grossely at the Preface, and the two first letters, with references where his reader should finde them confuted: but there he giueth them small comfort, as may be seene: hee would seeme a little to canuace *M. Champneys* letter, which followeth, and frameth his aduersary to his minde, finding fault where there was none, as any man may see that wil. That which *Ma. Champney* calleth *an extraordinarie authoritie*, this authour turneth it to *an extraordinarie dignitie*, as if the priests had pretended, that they neuer heard of an *Archpriest* before. Then he commeth on to prooue the absolute authoritie of the Pope, to giue the Priests a Superiour, which the priests did alwayes acknowledge, as appeareth by their yeelding vnto it when they saw his Holines *Breue*, before which time it could not be proued to be his Holines order. That which the priests alledged out of the Canons, was brought to prooue what was the order of Gods Church, which order was broken by the appointing of a Superiour among priests, without their priuitie or consent. The letters which are cited in the 8. Chapter to prooue the consent of the priests, or desire to haue a *subordination*, are there shewed to haue beene written long after the Archpriest was appointed by the Cardinall *Casietane*. In fine, *M. Do. Ely* in his notes vpon the *Apologie*, doth defend *M. Champney* against this Libeller, in so ample manner, as it were superfluous to say any thing more thereof.

Next vnto *M. Champney* his letter the priests set *F. Parsons* his letter to *M. B.* vpon which there is a censure by *M. T. B.* which sorely troubleth this good mans patience, especially for that *F. Parsons* letter is diuided into 24 parts by the censurer, and so (sayth he) leapeth from one to the other, forth and backe, referring you now to this, and now to that, &c. This man knoweth well his owne disease: hee would goe on still, and tell his reader now this, now that, as it commeth into his head, and if his reader should fall to conferring one place of his discourse with another,



ther, then is hee vtterly shamed, his lye trickes are found, his falshood is discouered, his contradiction laid open, and whatsoever an euill cause needeth to colour it, is shewed to bee in his: yet lest he should seeme to say nothing, he will shew, that there was a contradiction found in *F. Par.* letter, which he sayth was no contradiction. And how doth he proue this: *F. P.* saith, *that from May to Nouember, is more then halfe a yeere*; A iolly wise saying of so graue a father. But where, or when did this said saw passe him? Or how doth this alter the case more then if there were but two daies betweene *May*, and *Nouember*? The contradiction was, that *F. Parsons* said in his letter, that *no letter had yet appeared from M. Bishop, or M. Charnocke*. And in the same letter he confesseth that *hee receiued a stale letter from M. Bishop*. The next point for which the censurer deserueth blame is, for that he affirmeth that *F. Parsons* said, that an heretical proposition was layd to *M. Blackwels* charge, and would not himselfe affirme so much: he knew not perchance, what *Fa. Parsons* meant. *F. Parsons* said it, and *Fa. Parsons* must proue it. And whereas it is here said, that *M. Bishop* affirmed it at Rome, and proued it by a heare-say from *M. Charnocke*, but *M. Charnocke* said nothing of it: I wonder why *M. Charnocke* was not asked the question, but if it had bene so, *Ma Charnocke* would haue said so vnasked; And so he must haue done, if he had spoken of it: for as it seemeth *Fa. Parsons* had no will to haue the matter brought in question, and as it is to be thought not for any good will he bare either to *M. Charnocke*, or any of his fellows. This author is also contented to lergoe the 21. reasons giuen in the censure for the iustifying of the priests their forbearance to admit of the authority before the *Brene* came. His reader must take his word, that he hath assailed all these difficulties before: he was a cockish scholler, that made them, and there is an ende of a lubberlike answere to the censure, and the 21. reasons contained therein, and to the particulars also, there discovered of the two priests their entertainment in Rome, and what chanced to them there, and afterwards: to wit, the Iesuits and the Proctors inpostures to giue a pious colour to their wicked actions against the two priests.

There followeth lastly (saith this author) the answere of M.



sence with it so plaine, that it needeth no such comment as this fellow maketh; it beeing well knowen, that many priests and lay men doe stand for the Iesuites and Archpriest in this their faction against the priests, which would not if they feared not the like hard measure to that, which is meated to the priests. He stumblcth very grossely at the Preface, and the two first letters, with references where his reader should finde them confuted: but there he giueth them small comfort, as may be seene: hee would seeme a little to canuace *M. Champneys* letter, which followeth, and frameth his aduersary to his minde, finding fault where there was none, as any man may see that wil. That which *Ma. Champney* calleth an *extraordinarie authoritie*, this authour turneth it to an *extraordinarie dignitie*, as if the priests had pretended, that they neuer heard of an *Archpriest* before. Then he commeth on to prooue the absolute authoritie of the Pope, to giue the Priests a Superiour, which the priests did alwayes acknowledge, as appeareth by their yeelding vnto it when they saw his Holines *Breue*, before which time it could not be proued to be his Holines order. That which the priests alledged out of the Canons, was brought to prooue what was the order of Gods Church, which order was broken by the appointing of a Superiour among priests, without their priuite or consent. The letters which are cited in the 8. Chapter to prooue the consent of the priests, or desire to haue a *subordination*, are there shewed to haue beene written long after the Archpriest was appointed by the Cardinall *Casertane*. In fine, *M. De. Ely* in his notes vpō the *Apologie*, doth defend *M. Champney* against this Libeller, in so ample manner, as it were superfluous to say any thing more thereof.

Next vnto *M. Champney* his letter the priests see *F. Parsons* his letter to *M. B.* vpon which there is a censure by *M. T. B.* which forely troubleth this good mans patience, especially for that *F. Parsons* letter is diuided into 24. parts by the censurer, and so (sayth he) leapeth from one to the other, forth and backe, referring you now to this, and now to that, &c. This man knoweth well his owne disease: hee would goe on still, and tell his reader now this, now that, as it commeth into his head, and if his reader should fall to conferring one place of his discourse with another,



ther, then is hee vtterly shamed, his lye trickes are found, his falshood is discovered, his contradiction laid open, and whatsoever an euill cause needeth to colour it, is shewed to bee in his: yet lest he should seeme to say nothing, he will shew, that there was a contradiction found in *F. Par.* letter, which he sayth was no contradiction. And how doth he proue this: *F. P.* saith, *that from May to Nouember, is more then halfe a yeere*; A iolly wise saying of so graue a father. But where, or when did this said saw passe him? Or how doth this alter the case more then if there were but two daies betweene *May*, and *Nouember*? The contradiction was, that *F. Parsons* said in his letter, that *no letter had yet appeared from M. Bishop, or M. Charnocke*. And in the same letter he confesseth that *hee receiued a stale letter from M. Bishop*. The next point for which the censurer deserueth blame is, for that he affirmeth that *F. Parsons* said, that an heretical proposition was layd to *M. Blackwels* charge, and would not himselte affirme so much: he knew not perchance, what *Fa. Parsons* meant. *F. Parsons* said it, and *Fa. Parsons* must proue it. And whereas it is here said, that *M. Bishop* affirmed it at Rome, and proued it by a heare-say from *M. Charnocke*, but *M. Charnocke* said nothing of it: I wonder why *M. Charnocke* was not asked the question, but if it had bene so, *Ma Charnocke* would haue said so vnasked; And so he must haue done, if he had spoken of it: for as it seemeth *Fa. Parsons* had no will to haue the matter brought in question, and as it is to be thought not for any good will he bare either to *M. Charnocke*, or any of his fellows. This author is also contented to lergoe the 21. reasons giuen in the censure for the iustifying of the priests their forbearance to admit of the authority before the *Brene* came. His reader must take his word, that he hath assoiled all these difficulties before: he was a cockish scholler, that made them, and there is an ende of a lubberlike answere to the censure, and the 21. reasons contained therein, and to the particulars also, there discovered of the two priests their entertainment in Rome, and what chanced to them there, and afterwards: to wit, the Iesuits and the Proctors inpostures to giue a pious colour to their wicked actions against the two priests.

There followeth lastly (saith this author) the answere of M.



Bishop to the same Epistle (F. Parsons letter) containing two parts: the first about the iustifying the causes of their not yeelding to the Card letters, wherein for that there is nothing singular from those reasons, which his fellowes have alledged before, and by vs in diuers parts of this Apol. haue bene examined, and shewed to be either false, or feeble, wee passe them ouer in this place. His reader must haue a strong faith that he hath seene wonders in the *Apologie*; And that he needeth no note in the margent, to direct where any thing hath bene proued false or feeble, he must remember, if he can: if he cānot remember, yet he must make himselfe beleue, that he doth remember it, or els he shal be accompred among the factious.

The second part treateth of their vsage (saith he) in Rome, wherein diuers particulars are said by him with such passion, as men that knew him before do wonder at him, seeing the contrary may be proued by most authentical testimonies & witnesses yet alive. But vntil these authentical testimonies be produced, M. Bishops credit will ouerpasse this authors impostures, why were not these testimonies and witnesses produced? wherefore are they kept, as though they were ashamed to be scene? how could the story of their vsage be set downe more in particuler, then is set down in the books published by the priests? and what one particuler is proued to be otherwise, then there is said? And as for the exception against M. Bishop for a passion: that is a most foolish exception; for M. Bishop hauing shewed how falsly he was accused and slandered, vseth these words, pag 174. This fellow miscounreth the page, and the sentence. *What an irreligious and damnable slander then was that inuented of purpose, to haue vs taken, and shut up before we were heard, that they might haue the deliuey of our message, and be our interpreters & Proctors, and so make vs say what they listed, and our matter to be such as they would haue it?* This fellow citeth his words in such sort, as if he would haue his reader not onely to thinke, that M. Bishop was in a passion, but out of this sence also, that an *irreligious and damnable slander* was inuented of purpose to haue vs taken and shut up before we were heard, &c. As though Ma. Bishop had called his restraint an *irreligious and damnable slander*. For by this meanes will this author turne away his readers conceit from consideration of the slander, to consider



consider onely of the restraint, as if that were the slander mentioned, which is a most absurd thing. Yet must his reader so conceiue of it, and this author in this 177. leafe (having playd some of his old prancks,) concludeth in this maner; *How then doe they exclaime, and call this restraint of theirs an irreligious, and damnable slander?* But for the iustifying of the restraint, note I pray you, how this author bestirreth himselfe.

*But to this (saith he) we aske him (M. Bishop) againe, is this so hainous, or damnable, or unusuall a matter to restraine a couple of Priests, where so many complaints had bene written of their presumption and contempt, and of the scandall raised by their contention, as we haue set downe before? And doth not euery Prince thus to greater men then they are, committing them first, and after hearing their cause?* To this question I answer, that the two Priests comming to the Iudge at their great charge, and with great paines (as a winters iourney from England to Rome, will prooue to an indifferent man) were not to be thought either that they would runne away, or hide themselves from the Iudge, neither doth any Prince commit any man, that offereth himselfe vncalled to his triall, vnlesse the subiect be such, as the King may feare him, that he will raise strength against him, as may overthrow him and iustice. How many doe daily see, that are subiect to the law, even of life and death, who goe at libertie vpon their friends bonds, that they shall appeare before the iudges at the time appointed, to answer to what shall be pleaded against them? Prisons are onely vsed for such, as of whome there is cause of feare, that they will not come to their triall. these Priests came to Rome voluntarily, and being dealt withall very earnestly by *Fa Parsons* to returne into England with letters from the generall of the Iesuits and the Protector to the Superiour of the Fathers, and the Archpriest (himselfe confessech in his letter of the 9. of October 1599 which is set in this English booke) it is an argument, that they had no will to start, but to goe forward in the businesse, for which they voluntarily went. But besides all this, whereasthis fellowe talketh of informations giuen against them, and citeth in the margent, cap. 9. wee haue prooued, that all these letters were written long after that his Holinesse was induced to restraine them:

for



for as there we haue shewed, his Holinesse was resolved vpon the 17. of *October* to restraine them, and the first letters, which are brought there by this authour, and could concerne the two priests, were not written vntill the 25. of that moneth, & were to goe to Rome to the Protector, and from him backe againe to *Ferrara*, where his Holinesse lay, and was long before resolved to restraine the two priests, as the letters of *F. Bellarmine* (now Cardinall) doe prooue, which are cited by this author in his 9. Chapter 120.

*Further* (saith this fellow) *we would aske them, Were not they heard afterward so much, as they would say or write?* No good sir: for when they demanded the copie of the libell which was put vp against them, before the two Cardinals, *Caietane* and *Burgheze*, by which occasion was giuen them to say and write, they might not haue it. And if their earnestnesse to haue that libel to make their answer, had not bene so great, there would haue wanted matter and cause to haue kept them prisoners afterward: for this was the cause why *M. Bishop* was committed againe to prison, for that he was ouer earnest (as they said) in this point: and being demanded why *M. Charnocke* was also committed, there was no cause giuen but this, that he and *M. Bishop* were fellowes, and for good fellowship they must be kept a while longer in seuerall prisons close, as they were before, that neither of them might come to the other, but at the Iesuites (who were their laylors) pleasure, which within a weeke after this their apparance, were once suffered to salute ech other, and to recreate themselves at such sport as the Students made, but the two priests were garded by the Iesuits *M. Bishop* was garded by *Tremaine*, who was Minister, or Vicerector of the College, and *F. Tho. Owen*, who was the *Confessarivus* in the College, and *M. Charnocke* was garded by *Fa. Parsons* and *Fa. Tichborne*, who was the Prefect of the studies, and then were these caried into the hall, where the Students were to recreate themselves, and were set one in the one side of the hall, the other in the other side betweene their gard, for an houre or more, and afterward were committed, as before: but they were tolde, that this was the beginning of their libertie, yet were they kept close prisoners about sixe weekes after this: and this I haue set downe, as I finde



finde it written in the story, which I haue seene of their vsage, to shew that they were not heard, what they would haue sayd, and written, and that they were committed againe, and kept in prison, because of their earnestnesse to say, and write more then their aduersaries had willed they should. And to this second question, *Had they not their papers brought vnto them, to see, reade, and interpret?* I answered, that in the time of their examinations, the petitions of the priests, which they caried with them, were brought vnto them to see, and set down in their examinations, what they were, and for what end they brought them, but no other papers were euer brought vnto them, neither could they obtaine to see any of them, after that they were taken frō them, although they stood earnestly to the deniall of some matters, which were sayd to be in their papers, namely where it was said that they brought a paper with them, which was directed vnto them in England, in this manner, *To your L L. of which forgery there is enough sayd in the censure pag. 127. 128. Had they not license* (sayth this author) *after all examinations made to goe, and speake with his Holinesse if they would?* No indeed: For as it is here confessed in the *Apologie cap. 9. fol. 134. M. Bishops examination ended 25. Ianuary, and M. Charnockes 4. Februarie, and M. Bishop was not set at libertie, vntil the 22. of April following, nor M. Charnock vntil the sixt of May, to wit, two dayes, or three alter that M. Bishop was commanded away from Rome. So that they were neuer at liberty together after that they were imprisoned, were they abridged of any lawfull iustification, that they would make for themselves, or was euer any petition of theirs, or demand not heard, or considered of?* Yes marrie Sir: for whosoeuer did heare of their petitions, and demaunds, or considered of them priuately, it is most certaine, that they were neither suffered to conferre one with another about those matters in which they were ioyned, nor to haue the aduice of any aduocate or Lawyer, as they desired, when they were cast into prison they knew not why: neither was the exception liked of, which they tooke against the Cardinall Caietane, as being no fit man to be their iudge, in a matter concerning himselfe, to wit, the institution of this authoritie made by him, neither were they suffered to haue the copie of the Libel, when they demanded



ded it of the Cardinall Caietane, to make their answer thereunto. And if this were not an *abridging of lawfull Iustification*, I confesse I know not how a lawfull Iustification may be abridged. And thus with iudgement that the priests will abide no gouernment, he endeth this chapter, and prooueth his suspition out of an answer which M. Bishop made, *Sunt Sacerdotes, &c.* they are secular priests, and will liue freely, as it becommeth priests, and will not be bound to Rules: for this indeed sticketh in the Iesuits stomacks, that they are not esteemed of all men as their Masters, Directors, Lawmakers, and Rulers, and for that cause, vnder pretence of good order, they doe deface all those who will not subiect themselves vnto them. If the priests determine to liue as becommeth priests, they doe as much as belongeth vnto their estate, which if other men would so haue done, these stirres had neuer been in England, howsoeuer they deceiue the ignorant with a false shew of holinesse, and the name of liuing vnder Rule. But now we come to the principal part of all this *Apologie*, and that is to maintaine *Fa. Parsons* credit, in which the twelfth chapter is almost all spent.

## C H A P. 17.

*How this Author busieth himselfe to purge Fa. Parsons of his expulsion out of Baliol Colledge at Oxenford and other matters wherewith hee is charged. Apolog. cap. 12.*

**I**N the twelfth chapter this author handleth the accusations (which hee calleth *calumniation*s, and *slanders*) which he sayth are layd vpon *Fa. Parsons* without all foundation of trueth, or regard of *Christian and priestly modesty*: hurtful to the *Catholicke cause*, and gratefull to the *emie*: Such a good conceit hath this author of *Fa. Parsons*. He will also here set downe a letter of a blessed Martyr, touching one of the chiefe calumniationes: which letter he confesseth in the end of the *Appendix*, he did mistake, and hath for shame pasted on a piece of paper, where els all the world would haue discovered him, to haue beene  
a most



a moſt wicked calumniatour: Thus hee beginneth.

*By no one thing more doe we thinke our diſcontented and deceiued brethren, to diſcouer the lamentable ſpirit, whereunto they ſeeme to be giuen ouer at this preſent, then by their paſſionate proceeding toward this Reuerend religious man, whoſe merits towards them, and theirs, and vs all are not unknownen. He might haue added, nor unrequited in all ſuch ſort as honeſt prieſts may: who are alwayes ready to diſcharge themſelues in all gratefull manner towards him, or any other, who ſhall deſerue it, which doubtles he doth not, who for leſſe then a meſſe of portage, looketh for more then a large inheritance, and vnder colour of doing well for ſome, doth miſchiefe to all, and layeth a plot only for his owne preferment: as hath been ſhewed by the attempts which haue been made by him, and his officers in the Colledges erected by his meanes, where prieſts and others haue been induced to ſubſcribe to forreine titles, yea and to come in perſon againſt their owne countrey: for which in common ſenſe he looked for a reward at their hands, in whoſe behalf he had thus ſeduced thoſe, who were vnder his charge: which maketh me marueile more at the boldnes of this fellow in his applying of Scriptures againſt the prieſts in the behalfe of *Fa. Parsons*, eſpecially at his blaſphemie, where he ſayth that *F. Parsons* (a moſt wicked, and ſinfull wretch, and in whom it is well known there is ouer much poſſibility to deſerue a farre worſe death, then ſtoning) may ſay with Chriſt himſelfe, and to his imitation, multa bona opera oſtendi vobis, propter quod eorum opus me lapidatis? They haue returned me hatred for my loue toward them: they haue hated me with vniuſt hatred, they haue payed me euill for good, I haue procured them many benefiſts, for which now they goe about to ſtone me. And when poore fooles doe ſee ſuch a conglomeration (to vſe his owne word) of Scriptures, they neuer reflect, how the deuill himſelfe, and other to his imitation doth cite Scriptures, and ſet a better ſhew of matters, then theſe men yet haue done, who neuer came to the point of this controuerſie, but beare off ſtill. And when they ſay any thing concerning it, they fetch it ſo farre off, as a thing done in this moneth, muſt ſtay to be thought vpon, by occaſions offered many moneths after, as is ſhewed in the eighth and ninth Chapters which this author*



here quoteth in the margent for his readers great comfort, and edification: But he will passe to the particulars.

The first particulars are, that *Fa. Parsons* is called *Parsons*, alias *Cowbucke*. And this is taken in very euil part, notwithstanding diuers in England are called *so* alias *so*. And this being so ordinary a matter in England, many do doubt that this author knoweth some cause, why he should winch at it, as hee doeth. And whereas he saith, that no one of the kinred were euer so called: it is certaine that a brother of his, who liued in a house with *M. Brinkly* here mentioned *fol. 183.* was called *Cubucke*. And whereas it hath been said, that by occasion of his dealing, in some matters the capitall lawes were made in England, his letters are shewed of the 24 of Ianuary to the Earle of *Anguise*, which doe testifie how he busied himselfe in State matters, vpon his first comming into England, although he would cloake his dealing with Religion.

The second imputation (as hee calleth it) that *Fa. Parsons* came away, is euident, neither is it to be excused by his generall care of the cause: for as the priests say, and *M. Do. Ely* confirmeth it in his notes vpon the *Apologie*, pag. 211. the two elder Seminaries did send into England more priests, and nourished in them greater numbers of schollers at one time (as hee thinketh) then these new Seminaries with the old now decayed will furnish to send into England in diuers yeeres. And for the number of students, priests, and proper youthes, there were moe for many yeeres together (so long as *D. Allen* gouerned) in these Seminaries at one time, then are now, or hereafter like to be in all the Seminaries, put them all together. *I haue seene* (sayth *Do. Ely*) *fiftie priests in one yeere sent out of Rheims, and yet fiftie other priests remaine in the Colledge St. ll. Haue all the Seminaries so many in them now? no, no.* And the Catholicks in Scotland haue had more increase by the Seminary priests, then by the Iesuits, whatsoeuer this author affirmeth, *fol. 185.* For the Iesuits taught the Scottish nation how to keepe their consciences locked vp, and to goe without any conscience to the protestants Churches, as good proote will be made. But after all *Fa. Parsons* good deeds, for which (for so much as they may be called good) he hath and shall haue many thanks, this author  
enlargeth



enlargeth himselfe very farre, when he sayth, that without these good deeds it is like, that the priests had not now bene priests, neither without nor within England. And why so? *you shall find that many of them were sent in by him.* This is true, and more then a good many haue beene sent by him. And if we would wrangle with him, wee might say, that he sent some to disgrace the whole body of Secular priests, or els they had neuer ben made priests by him, he being told before such particulars of them, as if hee had had any care of the Church, hee would not haue made them priests. But put the case, that the Seminarie of *Rhemes*, had not decayed by the erection of the new Seminaries, why might not these, and many more then now are, be priests, both within and without England? Can this author say so much of all the new Seminaries together with the olde also, as M. Doct. *Ely* hath testified for that of *Rhemes* onely? But if this author can deceiue his reader, it is as much as he desireth, which hee thinketh will take best effect, if hee could perswade him, that the Seminaries haue more flourished since *F. Parsons* going out of England, then before: although nothing so many priests haue come into England, as did before, according to the rate of the time.

*The third accusation against F. Parsons is (sayth this authour) that after his going out of England, hee neuer ceased to exasperate the chiefe magistrates with libels and factious letters.*

This accusation dependeth in the prooffe vpon the testimonie of such, as to whome his letters haue beene shewed: and by his *Greenecoate*, and such like pamphlets, but especially *his booke of Titles*, wherein he discouereth his intention for the translation of the crowne of England to the Spaniard, which also his trecherous attempts in Spaine among the students, haue made more manifest, by hauing them to subscribe to that title, and by thrusting them into the inuaders ships: and all which heere is said in commendation of that booke, is and will be sufficiently answered by those, who haue vndertaken to answer it. And thus also is satisfactiō given to the fourth matter, against which this author taketh exception, as against a manifest calumnation; for his letters haue ben intercepted and shewed to diuers, although they are not put in print. And in a late booke, enti-



tuled, *A Manifestation of spirits*, there is some feare shewed, that his letter to the Earle of *Anguise* is intercepted.

*The first calumniation* (hee sayth) *might be diuided into many parts*: But to quit the accusers hee telleth his readers, that the Temporall magistrate doeth not presse the priests, but fauour them rather: which of late is very true, since they haue knowen the difference betweene priests and Statists, although the fauour be not so great, as it might be and may be, when her Maiestie may be thoroughly informed of the priests their trueth and loyaltie to her person, crowne, estate, and dignity, yet haue not the priests vled this little fauor, which they haue had, to the afflicting any of their Catholicke brethren in durance, as here it is most maliciously suggested, but to the comfort of many.

For answere to the sixt accusation against *F. Parsons*, the reader must goe looke in the eight Chapter, whither wee also doe referre the Reader for answere, to what is there brought by this author.

Now followeth a defence of Father *Parsons* against what is related in the *Latine* booke of the vsage of the two priests that went to Rome. And this fellow sayth all out of authentick informations. As first that Father *Parsons* did intertaine the two priests *kindly* in his owne chamber. They confesse they were interteined after a long difficultie. But what *authentickall prooffe* is there, that he did it *kindly*, or that it was done without difficultie? He told them, that they might not talke with any of the schollers, and no one of the schollers can say, that euer they did talke with any of them, but one, whom *M. Bishop* was very desirous to see: and he was brought to *M. Bishop* by the *Confessarius* of the Colledge, who stood by, and heard al which passed; *M. Charnocke* did know, that there was one in the Colledge, whose mother is his cousen germane, and neuer coueted to talke with him. The quarrell which was against these two priests, was for talking with such as were appointed by *Fa. Parsons* to attend them in the hospitall, whereof he, who is here said to be the *vertuous priest*, was a Iesuit in a Secular priests coat, and shortly after wore a Iesuits coate, and died among them. And the occasion of this talke was ministred by this *vertuous priest*, and it was not of this present controuersie, but about



bout *M. Edward Tempest*, concerning whom it was said, that he was hardly dealt withall, in regard that such as vsed to intertaine priests at their first arriuall in England, were perswaded not to intertaine him; And that some of his neere friends were told, that in conscience they could not relieue him. An other was a ieast, which had chanced about 20.yeeres since in the Colledge of Rome: which because it concerned one, who was chosen in England for an assistant, the matter was taken hainously, yet was the occasion hereof also ministred by that *vertuous priest*, and the matter it selfe was but a mery tale. And this is al, which was alledged by *F. Owen* the Iesuit in the name of *F. Parsons*, against the two priests: yet doeth this author most shamelesly relate, that the two priests had talked that, which might raise or renew sedition among the schollers. But this, and all which foloweth, is doubtlesse brought in this place, that this author might shew, how he could gall his reader with his owne tale, as an *authenticall testimony*, for other testimony there is not. That also which is here gaine said of Cardinal *Bellarmines* letter, was said vpon the relation of those who saw it, although they haue not the copy to shew. And for so much as concerneth the principall point of *F. Bellarmines* letter, to wit, the imprisoning of the two priests, it is confessed in his *Apologie* *Cap. 4. fol. 120.* out of the same letter. The priests there being imprisoned in the Colledge, is reputed a great benefit vnto them. They thought it not so, but onely in this respect, that they thought their liues were more in safety in the Colledge, then in a common prison: But in respect of the common cause without doubt it had bene a great preiudice, had they had any hope of iustice. But their hope was small, when they saw that they were to be infamously caried away to prison, before they could get audience. But it troubleth this author much that *Fa. Parsons* should be termed a *Taylor*: especially there being another, who had the keyes of their chambers to bring them meat, and all other necessities: but he telleth not who had the keyes all the rest of the day. If *F. Parsons* had not bene seene to weare them at his girdle, this matter might haue bene somewhat clementer caried: but it was too open to be excused.

Next followeth a defence of *F. Parsons* for his shewing of *M.*  
*Char-*



*Charnocks handkerchiefs, and night coyses, which (this author saith) were so wrought with silke, and gold lace, as they might seeme to serue for any Secular prince in the world, and the socks for his feete were of so fine Holland, as the Commissary said he was well assured, that his Holines neuer woare such for his shirts. You must imagine, that this relation is very authentically, although M. Charnock had neither handkerchiefe, nor night coife, that any Iesuite in England would vouchsafe to weare, they were so meane: I haue seene the night coife, and it is wrought in deed with silke. For it hath a border of blacke silke about it 3. fingers broad: and all the rest of the cap is plaine Holland, it hath some 6. pennie-worth of gold, and siluer edging, and as many as haue seene the cappe wonder at the impudencie of this Author: who perchance did thinke the cappe would not haue bene kept. The conceit which is made of his handkerchiefes is much more ridiculous. And by the tale of his sockes this Author bringeth into my minde a tale of a preacher, who tolde his parish, that Christ fed fve hundred with such a small quantity, and being told softly by the Clarke, that they were fve thousand, he bad him hold his peace like a foole, and told him, that if he could perswade the people, that they were fve hundred, he had done a good dayes worke. I vnderstand that the Commissary sayd, how that his Holines did not weare so fine cloth in his bands. But this author thought this was too much to be beleeued, and therefore he set it downe, the Popes shirts. Whereupon (saith he) conferring with M. Charnocke himselfe (in the presence of Fa. Parsons and M. Bishop, vpon the 8. of April, when they were to haue the first fauour to speake together, and to walke at libertie in the College at certaine times) when answer was made, that priests now a dayes for dissimulation are forced to vse such things in England: he replied that at the leastwise it was not needefull to bring such strange delicacies to Rome; and that albeit in some externall apparell, dissimulation might be tolerable in English Priests at home in respect of the times, yet in such things whereof their vse was onely in secret, as night coifes, and sockes, and the like, he saw no neede of excesse, or dissimulation. And this was all that passed in this matter, vpon the faith of such an honest man, as writ this Apologie. But now sir, one tale is tolde, the other is not told: which*



which is that *M. Charnockes* answer was to this effect, that *Priests* traueiling up & down in England, were to vse such things as were fit for such persons, as they bare in their trauaile, especially when they lay not in Catholike houses, where they were knowen, but in common Innes, where neither night-coifes, nor socks were vsed in secret. And for his bringing those things to Rome, his answer was, that hee had necessary vse of them at his comming out of England, & making account to returne againe, he had little reason to throwe those things away, after that they had the first time serued him. And if it had pleased them at Rome to haue left his Truncke vnsearched, the cap had neuer ben seene in Rome. And *M. Bishop* being requested to say what he knew of *this strange delicacie*, affirmed that he had neuer seene it before. But if *M. Charnocke* had either worne it by the way, as he trauailed in England to the sea coast, or at sea, where he was not knowen, nor willing to be knowen for such as hee was, what an absurd exception was this, that he did bring such things to Rome, as though he ought to haue cast them away? But this fellow careth not what halfe tales he telleth, to make his Reader beleue any thing, which might any way tend to the discredite of a Priest.

The long tale which this author telleth of *Fa. Parsons* departure from *Oxford* I will omit: because it runneth into many particulars, of which I haue no knowledge. But the trueth is, he was expelled, and the bells were rong at *Magdalene College* for his expulsion. And this authour his charging the fellowes with the breach of oath, when they made knowen his expulsion, is very ridiculous.

The causes of his expulsion I omit to set them downe in this place, as they are deliuered vnto vs: onely this I note, that it was not *for religion*, howsoeuer he might haue an inclination thereunto, and might be the worse liked of therefore by some: for of this imputation or *slander* (as he called it) he offered to a Gentleman of the Temple to cleare himselfe by oth. But when the fellowes proceeded to his expulsion, and no man stood for him, hee requested that he might resigne: to which the fellowes yeelded. Then did he write in this manner: *Ego Robertus Parsons socius Collegij de Baliolo, resigno omne meum ius, titulum,*



& claimeum, quem habeo vel habere potero, societatis mee in dicto Collegio, quod quidem facio sponte, & coactus die decimo tertio mensis Februarij, Anno Domini 1573. I Robert Parsons, fellow of the Colledge of Balioll, resigne all my right, title, and claime which I haue, or may haue, of my fellowship in the same College: which I doe of mine owne accord and compelled thereto the 13. of February, in the yeere of our Lord, 1573. This being done, he made request that this might be kept secret for a time, and that he might keepe his chambers and scholers as a fellow of the house, which was also granted vnto him: and thereupon was this decree written as followeth. *Eodem tempore decretum est unanimi consensu Magistris & reliquorum sociorum, ut Magister Robertus Parsonus nuperime socius retineat sibi sua cubicula, & scholares quousque voluerit, & communia sua de Collegio habeat usque ad festum Paschatis immediate sequentis*: That is, It is decreed at the same time by the generall consent of the Master, and the rest of the fellowes that M. Robert Parsons late fellow, doe retaine his chambers and schollers, as long as he will, and haue his commons of the College, uniill the feast of Easter next following. But F. Par. perceiuing shortly after that his knell had bene rung at Magdalene College, and how he was mocked by some in the house, he left the College and went to London, where he conferred with a Gentleman of the middle Temple about his trauaile to studie phisicke, to whom hee offered to take his oath, that he was slandered with the name of a Papist, and that hee neither was a Papist, nor euer meant to be one. But withall this is to be noted that this authour appealing fol. 193. to the Registers of Balioll colledge: the Registers haue bene sought, and there is some little difference in the words of the Resignation: for where we haue cited it *sponte & coactus*, now there is a dash through &, and this word *non*, writtē ouer head, a manifest signe of some false dealing. For it is not likely that & in that place would haue bin written for *non*: it maketh a cleane contrary sense. Neither is the obiection well solued fol. 197. which brought F. Parsons in suspicion of bastardie: for there are diuers, who confirme as much as the priests said: that is, *that it was the common opinion through out the whole Countrey*. His quarrels with diuers of his order, and others, will be iustified: and the letter of M. Benstead will also be prooued to be falsified. But  
the



the patch which is clapped vpon the 2 o 1. leafe, argueth how forward these fellowes are to discredite the priests with most false and scandalous imputations, when they themselues are ashamed thereof. That which concerneth M. D. *Bagshaw* is to be answered by himselfe: who no doubt knoweth in what cases doubtfull answeres and equiuocations are to be made to curious questions: neither is it to be thought, that he disallowed thereof, but onely of the liberty which is in the Iesuites, and their adherents, in all their dealings with other men, through which all confidence is taken away among men, as not knowing what senses these fellowes will alleage, that they had in their speeches and actions.

C H A P. 18.

*How the Secular priests appealing to Rome, and going to his Holinesse for iustice against the vniust slanders of the Iesuits and their adherents are falsly, and with great ignominie to the Sea Apostolike, compared by this Apologiemaker to Alcymus and to Simon, who went to Demetrius and Apolonius, heathen persecutors of Gods people and his priests. Apol cap. 13.*

**I**N the 13. Chapter this Authour vseth gentle perswasions to his discontented brethren, and proposeth certaine considerations, and a better way for reunion againe, as he supposeth. In the first consideration occurreth nothing worthy noting, his rayling speeches excepted, & hudling vp of scriptures one vpon another, against the disobedient to their Superiours, which concerneth the priests nothing at all, who neuer disobeyed their knowen Superiours, but alwayes submitted themselues vnto them, as it is manifestly prooued in all their bookes, and more at large in M. *Collingtons* booke, and in M. D. *Ely* his notes vpon the *Apologie*. He maketh a recapitulation of some matters in the same false vaine, in which he writ this *Apologie*, as is sufficiently discovered in this answer to the places



quoted by him: and in the same kind is his second consideration, imputing the iust defence of the priests from the Iesuits imposture of *schisme*, and other grievous finnes to *emulation*, *hatred*, *pride*, *revenge*, *libertie*, and other his owne, and his fellowes humours.

In the third consideration he doeth explicate himselfe, how the priests dealt with the Counsell, and his first tale soundeth so shamefully false, as it were ynough to conuince an indifferent man, that this author had no honestie, nor care of his credit. And doubtlesse had there not bene a great dearth of paper, this place should haue had a patch vpon it, as was put vpon that malicious, and wicked glose against the same man, and his fellowes fol. 201. Note I pray you, the impudencie of this fellow. *First* (saith he) *as before you haue heard* (and in the margent he quoteth the 10. and 12. Chapters) *as soone as euer they understood, that their two messengers were restrained in Rome, and not like to preuaile, then D. Bagshaw was sent for from Wisbich to London, to treat with the Counsell, &c.* Could this man perswade himselfe, that euery mans wit was a woolgathering, when this doctour was sent for from *Wisbich*, and that no man would remember, how that this sending for him was about *Michaelmas*, or not long after, and that the two messengers were not restrained in *Rome*, vntill the *Christmas* after? This fellow his affirmation that *M. Bluet* had conference with the *Bishop of London*, *Counsell*, and *Queene* her selfe, for the printing and publishing of *these Libels* (as he termeth them) said to bee printed at *Roane*, is most false. For these bookes were not printed by any such meanes, but at the charge of the priests, and in most secret maner. And their charge was double in regard of the Printers danger; And this probable reason might satisfie an indifferent man, that there want not as good Printers in England, as are in *Roane*, and yet the bookes are full of faults. And if the bookes had bene printed by any such license, they would haue had more skilfull Printers, and not haue had so many, and so grosse escapes, euident arguments of the Printers insufficiencie. This authors relation also, that *upon M. Bluets conference with the Bishop, &c.* there was a generall search for taking of *Catholicks*, such as neuer lightly before hath bene heard of, is to be convinced  
of



of great impudencie, in that the most busie Agents of the Iesuits and the Archpriest, in the furthering of their seditious attempts, were neuer called vpon or searched: whereas contrary-wise the houses where the priests friends remained, were curiously searched, which was a greater argument, that the Iesuits, and their faction caused the search, then M *Bluet* or any of his fellowes. And this is euident by recounting the chiefe of the faction of the Iesuits, & Archpriest, who dwelled then in *London*, and were so farre from the danger of being searched or taken, as they were not broken of their sleepe, or any way molested, vnlesse it were by the Officers their reuell in other mens houses. The story also of the *discovery of their* (the priests) *print and bookes*, but *all restored againe with celeritie, and fauour*, is both false, and exceeding foolishly heere inserted. False in that the priests neuer had any Print, but to their double, yea treble charge, and by great friendship of a gentleman got their books printed, they themselves neither know where, nor by whom, but as it should seeme by some meane, and needy Printer, who in consideration of being well payd, aduentured to print them. Neither was any of their books at that time in the presse, or in any Printers hands, nor euer needed any restoring, either with celeritie, or fauour. I vnderstand, that about the same time the Iesuits had a presse taken, and many bookes, which were restored againe vnto them, but this was not in *London*, nor by occasion of this search. But by this may be seene the falshood of this fellowe. Now it remaineth, that his folly also be shewed. This search (he saith) was an effect of M *Bluet*s conference with the *Bishop of London*, the Counsell and Queene her selfe, as the printing was, and publishing of their bookes. Is it likely that the printing, and publishing of these bookes could be a cleare effect of M *Bluet*s conference with these, and that the Print was subiect to be taken, and the books also? Could neither the *B. of London*, nor the Counsell, nor the Queene herselfe protect the Print and the books, not onely from being discovered, but from being taken away also, that they should need to be restored againe? this search being also a cleare effect of the same conference with the Bishop, Counsell, and Queene herselfe. How doeth he forget himselfe? how grossely doeth he com-



bine his matters together? He must also tell his Reader, that the *Bb. of London* had *M. Bluet* to his house at *Fulham* for fuller conference, making him good cheare, as though the *Bishop of London* his table were not ordinarily to entertaine a greater man then *M. Bluet*, or that *M. Bluet* were of their disposition, for whom must alwayes be an extraordinary prouision, for reuerence to their fatherhoods. Master *Bluet* was also suffered to goe where hee would without a *Keeper*. And what harme was this? I haue not heard of any summes of money which the *Bb* should giue vnto him for any purpose, as this author suggesteth. But if it had beene so, yet whatsoeuer this author would haue his reader imagine, he cannot prooue that *M. Bluet* hath employed himselfe in any euill office. This most wicked impostor doth furthermore labour, to haue his reader to make no better conceit of *M. Bluet* and his fellowes, then of *Tirrell* or *Bell*, a couple of knowen enemies: yea a farre worse, seeing (sayth this impostor) that neither *Anthony Tirrell*, nor *Thomas Bell*, nor other (he meanes perchance some of his fellow *Apostataes* *Iesuits*, that haue precipitated themselves in this time of persecution) did euer engage themselves further with the *Councell*, then these men seeme to haue done. And how doeth this companion prooue this? Forsooth, by a letter of *M. Bluets* (as he sayth) of the first of *Iuly* vnto *M. Mush*, to which letter there is this subscription, *Yours Thomas Bluet*: and yet the letter speaketh thus of *M. Bluet*, as if he were not the *Inditer* thereof. I haue obtained by opening the cause vnto their honours, and to *Cesar*, that foure principall men shalbe banished after a sort to follow the *Appeale*, *D. Bagshaw*, *Bluet*, *Champney*, & *Barnley*: would *M. Bluet* haue written in this sort to any man, and haue set his name to the letter, as from himselfe? But marke, I pray you, what followeth: all prisoners, they shall be here with me on *Wednesday* next. And afterwards hee followeth on in the same kinde, speaking of the same men. A moneth they shall haue within the *Realme* of libertie, to ride abroad for money among their friends, and then chuse their port to be gone, with some countenance, &c. And after all this cloaking himselfe, as if hee writ not the letter, but some other, his name is put to it, as is said, *Yours Thomas Bluet*. Many wayes are sought by this companion to bring Master *Bluet* and the other priests,



priests, into an euill opinion with all Catholikes, and many interpretations are made of the cōtents in this letter. But among all the rest, I wonder how the Iesuits come to be talked of: *I haue layd the fault* (sayth this letter) *where it ought to be, and prooued that the Secular priests are innocent for the most part, &c.* This companiō in his commentary, expoundeth these words, *where it ought to be*, in this manner, *that is to say, vpon the Iesuits.* And why so? what haue the Iesuits at any time done, that no sooner can any mention be made of *a fault*, but euery silly fellowe can interpret, what is meant thereby, to wit, *some fact of a Iesuite?* haue they so badly behaued themselues in all mens opinion, yea in their owne, as no fault can be, but a Iesuit must be at one end? But this companion would haue his reader haue a conceit, that this their fault might be the defence of Catholike religion, as though Ma. *Bluet* (whose letter this is said to be) did esteeme that a fault. Is he not full fraught with most wicked malice, that would driue such a conceit into his readers head, against a venerable priest, and one who hath suffered in the defence of the Catholicke faith, before any Iesuite dared to come neere vnto England, for all those proud vaunts that they were the men specially raised by God, to ouerthrow *Luther* and his followers? What *M. Watson* did in Scotland, he is to answere it himselfe: but doubtlesse he was not employed thither in any such affaires, as this author affirmeth, by any of the priests. He hath spent time there (as other priests haue) to repress that wicked doctrine of the Iesuits, that a man might locke vp his conscience, after that he had heard masse, and then goe to the protestants Churches. Neither doe wee knowe what *meaning* any of those had to deale with the French king in any State matters whome this author so taxeth. Hee who is so well acquainted with *meanings*, wil perchance in his larger *Apologie* tell vs more newes thereof. The stories of *Alcimus* and *Simon*, and others, who went to *Demetrius* and *Apollonius*, and others here named, can haue no place here, vnlesse this companion doe compare his holinesse vnto *Demetrius*, as hee compareth the priests to *Alcimus* and *Simon*. For all the world is a witnesse for the Priests, that they went to Pope *Clement* the 8. to seeke for iustice, and that they sought not to any other for iustice in the  
contro-



controuerſie betweene the Ieſuites and them: although they ſought their princes fauour, which they might lawfully doe, and deſire to enioy it, as the Catholiques in the primitiue Church haue ſometime done: and doe pray vnto God duely for her prosperous raigne: and that God will incline her heart to haue compaſſion vpon ſuch her moſt loyall and faithfull ſubjects, as haue heretofore moſt vniuſtly ben condemned for the euill practiſes of a few buſie fellowes.

The fourth conſideration cōſiſteth of twelue ſpecial points, which I feare will lie heavy vpon their ſoules, who are guilty of theſe ſtirres. The prieſts make no doubt of the iuſtice of their cauſe. And while this matter doth hang in queſtion, this *Apolo-  
gie*, well conſidered, and aduiſedly read, doth it ſelfe very much prejudice their cauſe, in whoſe defence it pretendeth to be written: If it ſhall be hereafter iudged that the prieſts were *ſchiſmatikes*, becauſe they did not accept of the new authority, before they ſaw a *Breue* from his Holines, without doubt they haue much to anſwere for. But if contrariwiſe it ſhalbe iudged, that they were not *ſchiſmatikes*, then muſt the Ieſuits and their adherents be the men, who haue been the cauſe of all the euill which hath come vpon this ſlander raiſed by them againſt the prieſts: And vpon this alſo dependeth the fiſt conſideration: for if it be proued, that the Ieſuites and their adherents did iniurie the prieſts in ſo high a degree, and a publique infamie of *ſchiſme &c.* then will it not auaille them to ſay, that the prieſts ſhould haue conſidered, that it was a time of perſecution, and that they ſhould haue ſuffered this infamie, rather then haue ſtirred in their own defence. If this doctrine of his might paſſe currant in temporal warres, there would indeed quickly be an end therof: for by this rate euery mā that is wickedly inclined, might murder his fellow without any contradiction, for feare of endangering the campe, if the vniuſtly aſſaulted ſhould ſeek to defend himſelfe. This companion ſhould haue remembred that the prieſts ſent to his Holineſſe, to whom it belonged to determine this controuerſie, and that they haue not ſtirred in any thing, more then in procuring that the quarrell might come to his hearing: For which purpoſe they iudged it moſt neceſſary, to make the world acquainted therewith, hauing once before bene fruſtrated



red thereof, by reason of their ouer great confidence in the iustice of their cause onely.

In the sixt consideration this authour taketh his pleasure in discrediting the priests, who would not consent, that the Iesuits, the Archpriest, with the rabblement of their most wicked, and seditious adherents, shall esteeme of them, as of *schismatikes, soothsayers, idolaters, Ethnickes, and Publicanes*: And he would perswade his Reader, that they are not onely few in number, but *greene in credit, without scruple of conscience what they utter; and therefore not to be trusted in matters which concerne the liues, states, and honors of men, who shall fall out with them*: yea his Reader must vnderstand, that those who haue yeelded to the enemy in one or two steps, could neuer go backe againe, but must yeeld in greater matters, and discouer all they knowe against their brethren, if not more. He speaketh as clerklike, as if he had searched the greatest secrets of his factious adherents, which will one day perchance come forth, and the parties named who haue done as much, as he mentioneth. But as for the appellant priests, he cannot charge them iustly, that they haue yeelded in any such thing. If any priest hath yeelded any further, then to thinke himselfe highly fauoured, that there hath beene notice taken of his faith, and loyalty towards his Prince and countrey; let the priest be made knowen, and he shal be esteemed of accordingly by the priests: and if no man haue yeelded in any other matter, then is the *Apologie-maker* a notorious wicked imposter.

The last consideration is of the necessitie of vnion (which is handled with exhortations vnto it; and dissuasions from diuision) and of the facilitie of making it againe among vs, and to shew, that there is a great facilitie, he will aske his discontented brethren that shew themselves so mightily enraged, what is there which they would haue in this matter? who vexeth, or vrgeth them so, as they may not liue quietly if they would? A couple of reasonable questions, and therefore this answer is made vnto them. First they would haue that, which the Iesuits, the Archpriest, and all their seditious adherents are bound vnder paine of eternall damnation to perforce: that is, that these doe



make restitution vnto the priests, for those most wicked flanders of *Schisme, sedition, rebellion &c.* which are contained in Father *Lister* the Iesuites booke, and their owne most malicious stomackes, without any iust cause giuen vnto them by the priests. Secondly they haue prooued, that the Iesuites and Archpriest (with all the seditious followers) doe vexe them so much, as in them lieth, and doe vrge them so, as they cannot *liue quietly* by them: but in euery corner there is some of this sedition to warne all good Catholikes to flie them, not to giue them any entertainment, or reliefe. And all this is to driue them either to perish, or to belie their owne soules, with the great dishonour both of God, and his Church. And as for the Archpriests good nature, here specified, it is very ridiculous. He recalled his Censures, when the priests submitted themselves vpon the sight of his Holinesse *Breue*, which censures he had vsed against three priests, because they had appealed from him to the pope (as it is set downe in the booke to the *Inquisition* :) And I doubt not but that the Archpriest would be as glad now, that all were well accorded, as he was at the first attonement, and be as ready perchance to breake out againe, as then hee was: as it is prooued in the bookes to his Holinesse, and to the *Inquisition*, neither is there any man, that is in his wittes, but will thinke that the Iesuits and Archpriest would haue peace: that is, power to vse the Secular priests at their pleasure, and that the priests should suffer all manner of indignities both in fame, and otherwise, and not to stirre for anie thing, which may be done against them: least the Iesuites peace be broken, which they loue so dearely, and cloake it with extraordinary pietie in this place *fol. 221*: where they are sayd to haue stoode with the Archpriest and the rest in defence of his Holines ordination, as though the priests had euer resisted his Holines ordination, and not rather yeelded themselves presently at the sight of the *Breue*, before which, there was no Popes ordination. And to this the Iesuites their standing in defence of his Holinesse ordination, are ioyned most absurd positions of their desire not to meddle in the priests affaires: whereas it hath beene shewed, that they



they haue been the chiefe of this sedition against the priests. And their interpretation, that their dealing proceedes of loue, is to men of vnderstanding an argument of a factious disposition, and desiring of gouerning all sortes of people, whosoever must play the Apes part, to take away the enuie for their misdeedes from them. *They intend not* (sayeth hee) *to preiudice them in any preferment for the time present, or to come.* Hee were worse then madde, that would trouble himselfe with our Iesuites intentions, which varie as often as their tongues moue, and turne their intentions to serue best their owne turnes. Let the Iesuites their hindrance of all our nation beyond the Seas from al promotion, speake for their intentions: since that no place, or preferment there can be had, without degrees in schooles, which they haue induced his Holinesse to debarre all the English nation, vnder this other intention, that young men must not take the degrees, when they depart from the Seminaries.

And that their intention may be the more euident, that they will hinder euery mans preferment, they haue put into the Popes *Breue* a barre not onely for the proceeding in Diuinitie, the knowledge whereof they haue now also cleane taken out of the Colledge at *Doway*: but in either of the Lawes also Ciuill, or Canon: which are not taught in any of our Seminaries. Yet must all their intentions bee most excellent, and must not be thought to preiudice any for the time present, or to come. As for the time to come, were it in their hands to preiudice any man, all their protestations, and oathes would carie little credite but with such as know them not. In which as in all other their dealings, especially in this action the priests doe most willingly forgive them their falshood, and doe pray for them, that God will giue them and their adherents his grace to amende, what they cannot chuse but see is amisse in themselves. To which they may make a good steppe, if they will enter into their owne consciences, and consider of what great scandals, and harmes in Gods Church they haue beene



a very faulty occasion, by that most wicked imputation of *schisme* to most Catholicke priestes, and their obdurate standing in that sinfull opinion, without admitting any equall triall of the cause in question, which the priests did offer in most humble wise, before they rooke the course that now they take, and was onely left vnto them, to cleare themselves of so dam-  
nable a slander.

\* \*  
\*



A





¶ A REPLY TO THE  
Appendix of the Apologie,  
by J. B.

**T**HE author of the *Apologie* having seene other two bookes beside those, against which he writ his *Apologie*, maketh an answer (such as it is) vnto them, which answer he calleth, *An Appendix to the Apologie by the Priests that remaine in due obedience to their lawfull Superior*. As though an Appeale made from a superior vpon iust causes, and a lawfull prosecution thereof could not stand with *due obedience*. But somewhat must be said, and if it haue no pith in it, as euery indifferent reader will soone discover that want in this *Appendix*, it must be ouercharged with bigge words, which the *blinde obedient* must imagine would not haue bene vttered without iust cause, although they see none.

After a long conflict then (as it should seeme) in this author, whether hee should take notice of these two latter bookes, to which he hath made it knowen (both in this *Appendix*, and other two scurrilous Libels set out since this *Appendix* came forth) that he cannot make any answer, he hath aduentured to say somewhat of them, and that it might not bee made too apparant to the world, how little the poore man had to say herein, hee stuffeth these few leases with exceptions against those bookes, to which he pretended an answer in his *Apologie*, & enlargeth himselfe somewhat by way of a preface, wherein he telleth his reader, how vnwillingly he put his pen to



paper for the defence of our Superiors, and their lawfull doings, and proceedings against the intemperate impugnations by tumult and Libels of a few discontented brethren, &c. And no man can but believe him, that it was sore against his will, that he had such cause as he had to use his pen, although he never made Jaintie of his paines and pen, where hee thought he might discredit those priests, which he could not bring to his lure. And as for the priests their doings or proceedings, they have shewed themselves ready to give accompt thereof, and to prove both the lawfulness, and the necessitie, which was in withstanding the exorbitant proceedings of such, as having neither any Christian wisdom, nor honestie, abused our Superiors, and procured that all the priests should be brought into these streights, to wit, either to yeeld to the wicked designs of others, or to be made infamous all the world over. And to this effect was the treatise of *schisme* written by the Iesuits, and sent abroad not onely in England, but into remote places beyond the seas, to perswade such as would be blinde, that Catholike priests, who had liued in a long & most dangerous persecution for defence of the sea Apostolike, were now become *schismatics*, and why? because they did not, contrary to the lawes of Gods Church, yeeld their obedience to a creature of the Iesuits, intruded vpon them as their Superior, without any warrant from the Sea Apostolike, which hath commanded that no such superior be accepted, without a speciall warrant, or letters from the same Sea, as may be seene in that *extrauagant* of Pope Boniface the 8. *Iniunct. de electione*, and was afterward extended by *Iulius* the 3. to such as is our present Prelacie. And all the scandall which hath growne out of this contention, must be answered by those who most iniuriously did driue the priests to so hard a choice, and if the priests haue in the prosecution of their iust defence bin assisted by such, as in some other respect do disclaime from them, and other their actions, the Iesuits and their adherents cannot so cary it away, with saying that they haue *combined themselves in secret with the known enemies and aduersaries of our Catholicke faith*. But they must prove, that they haue made an vnlawfull combination, it being euident to the world, that there may be as wicked and vniust combinations betweene  
men



men of the same religion, as betweene men of diuers. And as it hath bene answered before, the priests haue iustified and cleared themselves sufficiently, by their apparance at Rome, from all suspicion of euill dealing, or other combinations, then which Catholike priests might make, and thinke themselves infinitely beholding to their gouernours, that they are accepted of by them in that degree in which they are. But listen how faire as false a tale he telleth his reader.

*The Apologie therefore (sayth this author) written by vs, was to stay somewhat this violent course (if it might be) by laying open quietly and modestly the true grounds of all these stirres and perturbations, and that not by inuectiues, exaggerations, or inuentions of our owne, as our brethrens books doe, but rather by calme, gentle, and modest narration, yea with the greatest loue and compassion of our hearts; alledging alwayes most authentickall proofes for that we say, speaking also the same in the best and most temperate maner we could, and pretermittting many things that might be more odious, if they had bene vttered: and of this wee make Iudges the readers themselves, that shall haue perused the same, or may hereafter. It is very strange that indifferent readers cannot see any of this in the Apologie. If we shall trust to M. Doct. Ely, to whom the Apologie was sent by a principall man of the Iesuits faction to be read, wee shall finde by the notes which hee made thereupon, that the true grounds of all these stirres, are not handled in the Apologie, but a foule stirre made with much impertinent stuffe, full of inuectiues, exaggerations, and inuentions of his owne, and his fellow partners in this businesse, and no proofes, but a fewe of their owne letters (a most ridiculous manner of proceeding) whereas the priests haue brought their proofes out of the originals of their aduersaries letters and writings published by them: and this dealing is also discouered in the reply to the Apologie, how this authour in most intemperate manner, and most odious termes, seeketh the disgrace of the priests for want of other meanes to wrecke himselfe vpon his aduersaries, who haue laid too sure and firme a foundation for him to mooue: and vnlesse a man will be most wilfully blind, hee may very well perceiue the distemperature of this brainicke companion, where he tearmeth the priests, children of iniquitie, libertines, and chargeth*



geth them with *ambition, enuy, hatred, contention, malice, pride, malediction, and other like.* His contemptible speeches also doe argue little *modesty* in him: but if he should say, that he had written no *Apologie* at all, his absurd faction must beleue him; although they see him write it, and haue it in their hands: so religious are our newe illuminated Catholikes become, if their guide tell them the tale.

But now (sayth he) *since the writing of the sayd Apologie, some other matters haue fallen out, which doe inuite vs to write againe:* and what are thole? forsooth, our discontented brethren haue set foorth two other books, and put them also in print, intituling the one, *The hope of peace, by laying open such manifest vntreuths, as are diuulged by the Archpriest, &c. Consider you how full of hope this way may be to peace.* I haue considered of it, and I iudge it a most effectuall meane for peace to haue falshood discovered, and the doubts or difficulties laide open, which were before shuffled vp in such sort, as the stirres brake forth againe presently after, without giuing so much respite, as to say there was a peace concluded. The other in *Latine*, whose title beginneth thus, *Relatio compendiosa turbarum, &c. A compendious relation of troubles, &c.* But now good sir, what of these? wherein doe these two bookes trouble you? will you heare his grieve? he hath tolde you so many idle tales in his answere to the two former bookes, that hee hath none left to bestow vpon the answere to these, and therefore hee will make quicke worke with them: and to beguile his deuoted the more cunningly, he beginneth to tell them a tale of a *Breue* of the 17. of *August 1601.* which he pretendeth here, that hee had not seene it when hee writ this Preface: yet he would not but his reader should conceiue, that he was very perfect in it, for he declareth, that there is a full decision of the cause in controuersie, determining all points, that haue beene, or may be in question among vs, or betweene our brethren, and their Superiour, or any bodie else. But as yet could no man euer say, that the priests were cleered from schisme thereby, or condemned as schismatickes, and how then are all points determined, that haue bene, or may be in question? or how are any matters determined, which were put vp in the appeale to his Holinesse? nay the appeale it selfe is not admitted, although  
the



the Archpriest did that, which his Holines could not without grieſe relate, as theſe words of the Brieffe import: *Quod dolentes referimus*: neither is there any one worde of the Ieſuites, or their diſorders once touched, but in a very fauourable manner: that moſt wicked and ſeditious libell, which they writ againſt the prieſts, is onely ſuppreſſed; and herein doe ſome of them moſt inſolently glory.

This *Breue* alſo is prooued in this preface both by the date thereof, and otherwiſe that it was gotten by the information of the one part onely, and how then could any controuerſie be ended as it ought to be? for it beareth date 17. of *Auguſt 1601*, which was long before that the prieſts arriued at Rome, although they were there long before they were bound to appeare in the proſecution of their appeale, as all men know, who know any thing in the common lawes, which allow two yeeres to the Appellants: and when his Holineſſe wrote the ſame (as though his Holineſſe wrote it) he had not vnderſtood (ſaith this author) of any of thoſe ſcandalous bookes written, and printed partly before, and partly ſince by our diſcontented brethren. If then he neither ſpake with the appellants, nor did ſee any of their bookes dedicated to himſelfe, or the holy office of the *Inquiſition*, by whom could he be informed in their affaires? or can any man of ſenſe imagine, but that there was moſt vnchriſtianlike dealing, that his Holineſſe muſt be perſwaded to ſhuffle vp matters of ſo great moment in our Church, to whome were preſented in the prieſts their appeale moſt euident proofes of the Ieſuites, and the Archpriest their diſorders, in the managing of our Church affaires? And as for the ſtyle, in which his Holineſſe is ſayd to haue written this latter *Breue*, we leaue it to others to ſcan, who haue liſt thereto, and can vnderſtand how great the iniuries haue bene and are ſtill offered vnto Catholike Prieſts, without any one word of ſatisfaction to be made therefore to them, who haue bene iniured: and let men of learning, who haue read, or hereafter may read the prieſts their bookes to his Holineſſe and the *Inquiſition*, iudge whether it was not moſt neceſſary for the prieſts, to publiſh in their owne defence: and the prieſts will not be their owne Iudges, whether they haue done, or doe ſtill, as they may in conſcience doe, in publiſhing,



lishing, vntill their fame be restored (which was vniustly taken away by the Iesuites in their seditious treatise of *schisme*, and the Archpriest his pretended *resolution from Rome*) and the controuersie decided, which hath bene the cause of all these troubles: for vntill this matter be fully ended, and the Catholikes satisfied, that the priests did as become Catholike priests to doe, there will be hope, that his Holinesse will not debarre the priests of such meanes as the lawe of Nature alloweth them, in the purging of themselves of such crimes, as their silence must needs argue a guiltinesse in, and their owne consciences tell them, they must (vnder grieuous sinne) free themselves from them. But marke I pray you, what deuises this fellow doth vse, to haue the priests forget the abuses, which were offered vnto them by the Iesuites, and their faction.

*And for himselfe ( his Holinesse ) seeing that the chiefe complaint and offence and petra scandali ( as it seemed ) was about the name of schisme and schismatikes , he is saide to haue taken that wholly away in this cause , both the matter, and name it selfe. See how he would haue his reader to thinke , that this controuersie was about certaine names, as though there was neuer any reall schisme laid to their charge. Were the Iesuits such blocks, as that they would for certaine names exclaime in this manner against the Secular priests, Harken, O ye factious, ye are rebels, ye are excommunicated, ye are fallen from the Church, ye are nothing better then Soothsayers and Idolaters , and as Ethnickes and Publicanes, besides the terrours of eternall damnation ? Were the Catholikes so barbarous, that for certaine names, they would in this time of persecution thrust Catholike priests out of their doores, and some with most impudent faces, some like eavesdroppers runne, or creepe about, to diswade the Catholikes from harbouring them, or giuing them any maintenance? But let vs see how his Holinesse is saide to take away the name , and matter it selfe, in this Breue : forsooth, forbidding any bookes, treatises, or writings to be made, read, or held thereof, and about that controuersie. This is a faire taking away of a matter : let vs then suppose, that there be no more bookes, treatises, or writings made, read, or held hereof, and about that controuersie : I aske whether the Priests were schismatikes or no : or what is this after-pro-*



ter-prouidence, or order to the purpose, for matters past? If the priests had bene as wickedly disposed, as the Iesuites, and had procured an infamy to haue runne farre and neere against them without iust cause, as this of *Schisme* against the priestes hath bene prooued to haue bene most vniustly spread abroad, how could they thinke themselves cleared of any such slander only by an after-suppressing thereof? or how could they thinke that thereby any satisfaction were made vnto them? But gladly would this authour haue it so, that the priestes being asked the cause of these present stirres, might be debarred of giuing the true cause thereof: for then might their aduersaries iustly triumph against them as troublesome people, and clamarous, and that they had busied themselves they knewe not why, or wherein. Had these Iesuites, and their adherents halfe that valor in them, which they would be thought to haue, they would not for very shame indent with their aduersarie, that he must come to the field without his armes, and themselves armed from the head to the foot: or were they men of that wisdom, of which their followers take them to be, they wold neuer haue committed so great a folly, as to leaue no other hope of helpe for themselves, then to procure that their aduersarie must bee forbidden to pleade for himselfe. If it be true (as their Libels will prooue it) that they accused Catholike priests of *schisme*, why should any priest be afraid to say, that he was in such manner accused? And if for quietnesse sake the *name* must be auoided, why for quietnesse sake should not the course be altered, which was taken against Catholike priests, when the Catholike Laitie was in that manner seduced by the Iesuites, to vse that sinfull name, when they named or spake of Catholike Priests? But it is no matter perchance, howe priests be abused by the new illuminated, so that they be not hereafter named *Schismatics*, and therefore this authour professeth, that he *procured to auoid it in his Apologie, though not knowing of this expresse prohibition.* For (saith he) *indeede the thing it selfe did euer mislike, and grieue vs.* Weladay, weladay, what thing was that which misliked and grieved you? was it the wickednesse which was committed in the slandering so many Catholike priestes, as would not (contrary to the Canons of holy Church, and vpon



many iust reasons) sacrifice to an Idoll, who how well soever it was meant vnto him, by him who had authority, had notwithstanding no authority at that time, at which he challenged it, as hath bene evidently proued in the priests their bookes; did you euer *mislike* that Catholike priests should be contemned, and dispised by euery factious and seditious companion, who vpon hope of some gaine thereby, would fit your eares, yea and your hearts with a *placebo*, without any regard of them, to whom they owed loue, and duetie? harken I pray you, what it was, which misliked, and grieved this fellow, *that so much contention, and falling out should be about a matter in the aire, where no man was named in particular.* This then was it which grieved this good fellow, that the priests would not be called, and vsed like *Schismaticks*, but would proue themselves to be Catholike priests, and to haue discharged themselves in all points, as became Catholike priests.

But this seemeth very strange, that *Schisme* (against which there are so grievous lawes in Gods Church, and against which *F. Lyster* the Iesuit and his fellowes, the Archpriest and all his faction inueyed so bitterly, and seduced the Laity in such sort, as they did as it were *schismatically* make a diuision in prayer, and communication, and Sacraments euen from their dearest friends, and vsed themselves most ingratfully toward their spirituall fathers) should now become no more then *a matter in the aire, where* (saith this fellow) *no man was named in particular.* And this last clause happily is true: for that they were *nicknamed*, and that *in particular*, and not onely pointed at by euery one of the Iesuits faction, but thrust out of the houses of those Catholicks, who had drunke of the Iesuits poyson, and were *particulerly* also decyphered in that most wicked treatise of *schisme*, which was diuulged by the Iesuits, the Archpriest, and the rest, as may appeare by that, which is said in that treatise Paragraph 6 num. 10. *Ad extremum in suum sempiternum dedecus legatos factiosos ad Pontificem factiosi isti destinarent.* That is to say, *At the last these factious haue to their eternall dishonour sent factious ambassadors to the Pope.* And in the next paragraph are the crimes of these factious set downe vnder this title, *Factiosorum crimina*, the crimes of the factious. Which are these, *Ye are Rebels,*  
ye



ye are schismaticks, and are fallen from the Church, and spouse of Christ &c. Pretty names: and so he goeth forward with such like; And can his reader thinke, that a Iesuit would rage in this maner against an aduersary *in the aire*? or that the particularities were not sufficiently set downe, by which all men had notice who they were, that were held for *schismaticks*, when the two priests were knowen, that were sent to his Holines, and many of them who sent them, or by whose consent they went? Can any man thinke, that these fellowes had either wit, or honesty, who would in action omit nothing, which might further the infamy or misery of Catholicke priests, and in words pretend, that the matter was *a matter in the aire*, as here it is said, or as the Archpriest affirmed in his letter to his Assistants the 23. of Iune 1601 (against which letter *the hope of peace* was written) *a matter of opinion, and therefore not worthy to make a matter of cōtention, which part soeuer was true*? So doeth it please these new illuminated to oppresse their brethren, and to make a sport of their miseries, and most absurdly condemne themselves of want of al honesty and charitie, who in a matter of so small moment (as they doe make shew) would enter into so desperate courses, and trouble our otherwise too much afflicted Church. But since that *the matter, and name of schisme* is taken away, I will not vse it, but in such case as of necessitie it must be vsed, and necessitie (as men say) is not subiect to any Law, neither can I thinke, that the priests being demanded the cause of their griefe, are forbidden by any Breue to say, that they were most vniustly both named, and vsed like *schismaticks*, neither can their aduersaries easily perswade them vnto it, what holines soeuer they doe pretend, or strict charge out of the Breue of the 17. of August 1601, of which Breue this author, not hauing seene it, (as he pretendeth) vndertaketh to relate not only the contents, but also some particular sentences, which he thinketh do make most for his purpose; and thus he goeth forward in his Preface.

The principall points of this Breue (as they are written to vs) are these: First that his Holinesse hauing read and perused the Appellation of our brethren made vpon the seuenteenth day of Nouember 1600, though not to this day sent, or presented from them, as we are most certainly enformed, but onely from the Archpriest, against



whom it was made, after due deliberation hee admitteth it not, but wholly annulleth it. Here is one main point of the *Breue*, his Holinesse hauing blamed the Archpriest for his proceeding, as may appeare where these words are inserted, *Quod dolentes referimus, which we relate* (saith the Pope) *with grieve*, yet notwithstanding doth not admit the Appeale (yet doth he not annulate it) and if vpon perswasion of such, as are loth to haue it prosecuted, he hath been induced to haue all mattets flubbered vp, as once before they were; there is no doubt to be made, but when he shall haue heard both parts speake (which is requisite to all Christian iustice) he will giue that satisfaction, which a tender father cannot deny to his oppressed children, who haue alwayes borne that honourable respect vnto that Apostolike Sea, that if an Archdeuill had bene appointed their superiour, they would haue accommodated themselues so farre, as they might, without dishonouring God, betraying his Church, or preiudicing their owne selues, yet would they haue sought (as now they haue done) with all submission for reliefe of the like miseries, or greater, if they could haue bene subiect to greater. But the *Breue* being made (as here it is confessed) before his Hol. saw any of the priests their bookes, & also before he heard the priests (as may appeare by the date thereof) it is no great marueile, that the *Breue* runneth in these termes it doth: yet is it somewhat strange, and perchance neuer had any president, that the priests are commended who receiued the Archpriest, before they did see the Popes letters, and that the other are discommended or checked, these hauing done no other, then they were bound to doe by the lawes of holy Church, and those other most contrary thereunto: for prooffe whereof I thought it fitte to set downe the extrauagant of Pope Boniface the eighth, which doth conuince as much as I haue sayd. *Iniuncta nobis debitum seruitutis exposcit, vt qui ad reformandos in Clero mores, & actus (prout nobis ex alto permittitur) solertiùs intendimus, ibi praeipue reformationis accommodare remedium apponamus, ubi maius respicimus periculum imminere.* That is, Our office requireth of vs, that we, who by Gods permission doe attend more diligently to the reformation of the Clergie, doe there especially put remedie of conuenient reformation, where we see most danger at hand.

And



And then he proceedeth to tell what this great danger is, and setteth downe the remedy. First therefore hee beginneth thus with the danger: *Sanè quam periculosum existat, quod aliquis in officio, dignitate, vel gradu fore se asserat, & pro tali etiam habeatur, nisi prius ipse, quod asserit, legitimis ostenderit documentis, tam ex ciuilibus, quàm ex canonicis institutis colligitur euidenter. Asserenti namq, cum mandatis principis se venisse credendum non est, nisi hoc scriptis probauerit: nec similiter creditur se asserenti legatum. Nunquam enim Apostolica sedis moris fuit, absque signatis apicibus undecunq, legationem suscipere. Sed nec dicenti se delegatum sedis eiusdem creditur, vel intenditur, nisi de mandato Apostolico fide doceat oculata, &c. Quod autem in illis, qui se Episcopos, vel superiores Pralatos, aut etiam Abbates, Priores, seu alios monasteriorum rectores, quocunque nomine censeantur, appellant, sit discussio celebris, & diligens facienda, luculenter apparet, si scandala & pericula graua (qua ipsorum parere possit communicatio indiscussa) diligentius attendantur. Hinc nos euocat ratio, ut cum pramissis alijs casibus, qui minoris existant periculi, sit ex constitutionibus editis iam prouisum, hunc ultimum, qui pericula grauiora minatur, nequaquam sine prouisionis opportuna remedio relinquamus.* That is, It is euident both in the Ciuil and Canon lawes, how dangerous it is, that any man should challenge and be taken to be in such an office, dignitie, or degree, vnlesse he can make lawfull prooffe, that he is as hee sayth: for there is not any credit to be giuen vnto him, who shall say, that he cometh by commandement of his prince, vnlesse hee shall prooue it in writing; neither in the like case is credit to be giuen to him, who shall say that he is a Legate: For the sea Apostolike neuer vsed to receiue an Ambassage from any place without letters. But neither is any credit to be giuen, or any reckoning to be made of him, who shall say, that he is a delegate of the sea Apostolike, vnlesse that hee bring eye prooffe, that he hath commission from the Pope. Then speaking a little of the promoting of such, as haue taken some orders, and that one saying himselfe to be a priest, must shew it: hee goeth forward in this manner, *It is also most apparant, that there must be a very great & diligent search in those, who call themselues Bishops, or higher Prelats, or also Abbots, Priors, or other gouernors of monasteries, vnder what name soeuer they goe, if the scandals and great dangers be diligently considered, which may come of the not discussing therof.* Where-



Wherefore, as in the former cases of lesse danger, there is provision made by former constitutions, so in reason can we not but provide some conuenient remedy for this last case, which threatneth greater dangers. Now the Pope taketh this order following, for the auoiding of these dangers, which if the indifferent reader will attentively marke, he shall haue light enough to iudge, how vniustly the priests were termed, and vsed like *schismaticks*, and *excommunicated persons*, in that they did not subiect themselves to Master *Blackwell*, who had not any warrant from his Holines, nor could shew any letters from the sea Apostolique for proote of his dignitie or authoritie, which hee challenged here ouer his fellow priests: he may also perceiue, what iugling there was at Rome, when his Holines was induced to discommend or condemne the priests, who did not receiue Ma. *Blackwell* in that dignitie or authoritie which he challenged, without hauing his Holines letters, and to commend those priests, who presently adinitted him, and maintained a most scandalous diuision against the other, because they did not in the like manner subiect themselves. These are the wordes of Pope Boniface: *Præsenti itaque perpetuò valitura constitutione sancimus, ut Episcopi & alij Prælati superiores, nec non Abbates, Priores, & ceteri monasteriorum regimina exercentes, quocunque nomine censeantur, qui apud dictam sedem promouentur, aut confirmationis, consecrationis, vel benedictionis munus recipiunt, ad commissas eis Ecclesias, & monasteria, absque dicta sedis literis huiusmodi eorum promotionem, confirmationem, consecrationem seu benedictionem continentibus, accedere, vel bonorum Ecclesiasticorum administrationem accipere non præsumant, nulliq; eos absque dictarum literarum ostensione recipiant, aut eis pareant, vel intendant.* That is to say, Wherefore by this present constitution, for euer hereafter we decree, that Bishops, and other higher Prelats, Abbots also, Priors, and others, who doe gouerne monasteries (by what name soeuer they are called) who are promoted by the Sea Apostolike, or are confirmed, consecrated, or blessed, (that is, receiue power to exercise their office) presume not to take upon them that charge, or the administration of the Ecclesiasticall goods; without letters from the said Sea, which doe containe this their promotion, confirmation, consecration or benediction, and that none doe receiue, obey, or respect them, unlesse they doe shew the said letters.

Now



Now you haue heard what remedie the Pope did take for preuenting the dangers of which he spake, that is, by pretending to be *in dignitie* or *office*, without sufficient prooffe; and this were enough for an indifferent man to see, what commendation they deserued, who receiued a Prelate, who challenged iurisdiction from the sea Apostolicke ouer two kingdomes, and had not any letters from the said Sea to shewe for his promotion, confirmation, or right to exercise any authoritie in either of them; and whether those priests do deserue a checke, who did according to the constitution or decrees of holy Church, in not receiuing, or obeying him, before hee shewed his Holines letters: yet doth the Pope make this more plaine by the punishment following. *Quod si forsan contra præsumptum fuerit, quod per Episcopos, Prælatos, Abbates, Priores, & alios monasteriorum regimina exercentes prædictos, medio tempore actum fuerit, irritum habeatur, nec quicquam interim iſdem Episcopi vel Prælati, Abbates, Priores, vel regimina exercentes de Ecclesiarum, vel monasteriorum prouentibus percipiant, eorundem capitula verò, & conuentus Ecclesiarum, & monasteriorum ipsorum, & alij quicunq; ipsos, absque huiusmodi dicta sedis literis recipientes, vel obediētes eiſdem, tamdiu sint à beneficiorum suorum perceptione suspensi, donec super hoc eiusdem sedis gratiam meruerint obtinere, &c.* That is to say, But if any shall presume to doe contrary to this, that which shalbe done in the meane while by the aforesaid Bishops, Prelats, Abbots, Priors, and other gouernours of monasteries, let it be as void, and of no force: neither shall the same Bishops or Prelats, Abbots, Priors, or gouernours haue in that interim any thing of the profites of the Churches or the monasteries: and the chapters or couents of those Churches and monasteries, and all whosoener shall receiue and obey them, without such letters of the said Sea, shall be deprived of their fruits of their Benefices, vntill they shall get pardon of this fact from the same Sea.

This decree of Pope Boniface is cited to this purpose by Pope Inno the third in his constitution *Sanctissimus &c.* and also a decree of Pope Gregory the tenth which we haue Cap. *Auaritia de electione, & electi potestate in sexto*: where the Pope hauing shewed that some perceiuing, that by law they could not enter into the gouernement of the Church, to which they were



elected, before they were confirmed, vpon couetousnesse, and damnable ambition procured the administration thereof, as Proctors, or Stewards, he maketh this decree: *Cum itaq; non sit malitijs hominum indulgendū, nos latius providere volentes, hac generali constitutione sancimus, ut nullus de cetero administrationem dignitatis, ad quam electus est, priusquam celebrata de ipso electio confirmetur, sub œconomatus, vel procurationis nomine, vel alio de nouo quæsito, in spiritualibus, vel temporalibus, per se, vel per alium, pro parte, vel in totum, gerere, vel recipere, aut illis se immiscere presumant &c.* That is to say, Since therefore men are not to be favoured in their malice, we (willing to make further prouision) doe decree by this generall constitution, that from henceforth no man either by himselfe, or any other, in whole, or in part, vnder the name of a steward, or procurer, or other new pretence, do presume either in spirituall matters or temporall, to exercise any dignitie, to the which he is chosen, before that his election bee confirmed. And the same Pope setteth downe in the same place the punishment, which such an offender shal haue, to wit a depriuation of al the right, which he had by his election. After these constitutions of Pope Gregorie, and Pope Boniface, there is another constitution of Pope Paulus the third of the like matters recorded by the same Iulius the third, who noting, *quod ante confectionem literarum gratia Apostolica est informis*, that is, that a grace giuen by the Pope is not of force, untill the letters be made: and shewing what little regard hath been had thereof, by all sorts of Ecclesiasticall persons (for all the former ordinances, or decrees made for that purpose) he confirmed, and renued the same, and willed, that they should hereafter be obserued, *Et sanctiones ipsas ad inferiora beneficia ecclesiastica (quocunq; & quomocunq; qualificata) ampli-ans, & extendens, hac sua in perpetuum valitura constitutione statuit &c.* And amplifying, and enlarging those decrees to all inferiour ecclesiasticall benefices, and howsoever qualified, he ordained &c. So that if by any wrangling shift this prelacie of the Archpriest (hauing no other name then of an Archpriest) should be sayd not to bee included within the *extrauagant*, although it bee a much higher prelacie (as being ouer two kingdomes) then a Bishop, yet is there no shift will serue after this amplification of Pope Iulius the third, beside the plaine text also of the lawe  
 cited



cited, where Pope *Gregorie* the tenth forbiddeth all administration, not onely in temporalities, but also in spiritualities, without a confirmation from the Sea Apostolike; and the intention of Pope *Boniface* most manifest, to put a remedy for such dangers, as might be by the challenging to be in any office, or dignity whatsoever, as from the Sea Apostolike, before any letters from the same Sea were shewed in testimony thereof.

Vpon these or the like considerations, the Cardinals of the *Inquisition* in their congregation vpon the 20. of *Iuly* last past, among other oppressions, which they concluded had bene vsed by the Archpriest to the Appellants, numbred this for one, and it was afterward confirmed by his Holines. *Cum sapè declarauerit ipsos esse schismaticos, rebelles & inobedientes.* In declaring often, that they were schismaticks, rebellious, and disobedient. By which it may appeare, what dealing there was at *Rome* about the making of that *Breue* of the 17. of *August* 1601: out of which this author citeth this sentence against the Appellants, *Vos autem filij presbyteri, &c.* But you my sonnes the Priests, which neglected to obey the Archpriest your Superior: what cause had you not to giue credit vnto the letters of your Protector Cardinall *Caietane*? truly you ought to haue submitted your selues to your superior, & to haue obeyed him. It is euident ynough to all, that there did want no cause why we did not admit of the Archpriest: for he pretended a promotion by the See apostolicke, but shewed no letters from the same See, as he was bound to do before he should practise his authoritie, or any receiue him in it vnder grieuous penalties. Other causes were also giuen ynough why he was not receiued before the first *Breue* came, which if his Holines had scene, who can imagine that he would haue rebuked the priests in this maner, in his *Breue* of the 17. of *August* 1601. But he did neither see the priests books, wherein they set downe their reasons of their refusal (as is confessed in this present preface) neither had he spoken with any of the priests, as is conuincd by the date of the *Breue*, and their arriual at *Rome* halfe a yeere after: And who knoweth not how matters may be caried, when one tale onely is heard, and that no iust iudgement can be giuen, where one side onely of a controuersie is pleaded. And



the case being now decided in the *Inquisition* for the priests, and the Archpr. condemned, as one, who many wayes did most vniustly oppresse them: it will not be hard for any indifferent man to iudge, where the burthen of scandals, breaches, and other hurts must lye, and how the highest Superior hath bene hitherto abused, and consequently also God himselfe highly dishonoured. But now letting go this most absurd insinuation: So as all the sharpe impugnations vsed against those letters, and the Archpriests authoritie from the very beginning are here shewed to haue bene vniust, and against the expresse will, meaning, and iudgement of our highest Superior, and consequently also (as of necessitie must be inferred) against God himselfe; as though the highest Superior could not in these matters, which doe not apperteine to our faith, be induced by flatterers or false felowes, to command that, which without offence to God cannot be obeyed, or at the least wise doeth not binde others to obey it: let vs see how this author gathereth his Corollaries.

It followeth also by the sweete and milde declaration of his Holines, though it be like ynough, that he will make some other of a more sharper kind, upon the knowledge and view of so many scandalous bookes, as haue bene put foorth afterward by our brethren, and thus lite pendente, while the sute hanged before him without expecting his Holinesse sentence in the matter, remitted to him by them, it followeth we say first that our good Archpriest, during all this time of tumultuation against him hath bene, and is our lawful Ecclesiasticall Superiour, and consequently that so violent impugning him, must needes haue bene very offensiue to God, and perilous to the impugners: and besides that such prohibitions of bookes, writings, taking away of faculties, or other punishments or censures layd upon any by him, for their disobedience are, and must be of validitie (seeing his Holinesse here taketh away none) vntill they duly submit themselues, and he remit, or recall the same againe, &c.

A very sweete and milde declaration of his Holinesse, by which a most iust appeale to the See Apostolike is not admitted, but annullated (as this fellow affirmeth) and a shew made of determining of all matters, but no man the neerer thereby: if this fellow say true, that his Holinesse did take away none of the censures or penalties, which the Archpriest layd or attempted



to lay vpon the priests for defending themselves from the infamy of *Schisme*, a most wicked and senselesse imputation. If this were so *sweete and milde a declaration*, being as it seemeth hereby altogether against innocent priests, what shal we thinke of that Declaratiō which was made the twentieth of *Iuly 1602* wherein consult had in the Congregation of the *Inquisition* (and was afterward confirmed by his Holinesse) the Archpr. is condemned for oppressing the said Priests: *in often declaring them to haue bene Schismaticks, rebellious, and disobedient, and for this cause forbid them the vse of their faculties, and that they should not defend themselves from that infamy*, and lastly after other oppressions there named, he is condemned *because he did not admit of the Appeale*, which they had made to the Sea Apostolike. If his Holinesse did with a *sweete and milde declaration annullate the appeale* in that Breue of the 17. of *August 1601*. how is the Archpriest condemned 20. *Iuly 1602*. by the same Pope, and the *Inquisition* for his not admitting therof? And if his Holines was induced onely vnder a colour of peace not to admit thereof, notwithstanding it was a most iust appeale, because in the prosecution thereof might greater stirres arise, how *sweetely or mildely* did he deale in *not recalling the censures, or penalties* with which the Archpriest did vniustly oppresse the priests, as is declared in the last consultation in the *Inquisition*? But perchance his Holinesse, seeing the malicious proceeding of the Archpr. and that his will was more then his power in the vse of his authority, thought it a very friuolous matter, to recall either censures, or other penalties, seeing that he did exceede his faculties, as in this Consult in the *Inquisition* is declared, and neuer kept the forme which was prescribed vnto him: which defect maketh voide all the proceedings of a Delegate, as the Archpr. was in this his office ouer the priests. And whereas the priests are charged, that they published bookes, *while the sute hanged before his Holinesse, without expecting his sentence*: reply is made, that the Archpriest inforced them thereto by punishing the Appellants while the sute hanged before his Holinesse, without expecting his sentence, and he punished and afflicted them by reason of their appeale, as hath bene proued, and the Breue of the 17. of *August 1601*. was procured against the priests be-



fore that either they were come to folow their appeale, or their bookes in his Holinesse hands, as here is confessed: so that his Holinesse could not be informed by them of their case, how it stood with them, and their aduersaries. And whereas also it is here said, that the Archpr. was all this while their lawful Ecclesiasticall Superiour, this Authour must finde how to satisfie all those lawyers, who affirme that a Prelate pretending to haue an authoritie from the Sea Apostolike is an intruder, if he vse his authority, without he shew his letters in confirmation thereof from the same Sea Apostolike, which it is euident the Archpriest could not shew for a whole yeere after that he tooke vpon him to play his prize against his fellow priests. During which time the priests had iust cause (as is shewed) not to accept of him, and after his confirmation hauing behaued himselfe most sinfully in his office, as it is determined by the Cardinals of the *Inquisition*, and by his Hol. himselfe (as appeareth by the copy of that consultation, which was had the 20. of *Iuly 1602*) his actions were iustly impugned, and this error of the author of the *Appendix* ouerthrowen, where hee holdeth it of necessitie, that *a lawfull superiour cannot be impugned without offence to God*. For these are his words in this Preface: *It followeth we say first that our good Archpriest during all this time of tumultuation against him, hath bene, and is our lawfull Ecclesiasticall superiour, and consequently, that so violent impugning him must needs haue bene very offense to God, and perillous to the impugnors. Can this fellow be any other then a limme of those, who were condemned in the Council of Constance, Sess. 15. for maintaining neminem gerere vicem Petri, vel Christi, nisi illum sequatur in moribus, or nullum esse Dominum spiritualem, dum est in peccato mortali?* This fellow must shew how without maintaining these errors he can make his consequent good: *A lawfull superiour is impugned, ergo it must needs be that God is thereby offended.*

The second Corollary, which this author draweth, is that the books against which he writeth are forbidden by this Breue of the 17. of *August 1601. because they treat expressely, and principally euery where the matter of schisme*. The procurers of this Breue are noted herein to haue shewed a little subtiltie, but neither wit, nor honestie: For how can they imagine that Catholicke bookes



bookes written in the defence of Catholicks, who were most sinfully slandered as *schismaticks* by the Iesuits, and their seditious adherents, can be iustly forbidden to be read, or kept, the slanderers remayning vncorrected for their wickednes, and no way abridged of their sinfull courses against the same Catholicke priests? For in the same *Breue* all the charge which is giuen, is giuen to the Secular priests, and they who were the malicious brochers of that sinfull slander of *schisme* against Catholicke priests (yea although there be mention of their treatise of *schisme* against the same priests) are not once named, as a part in the controuersie, but are at libertie to abuse the priests as much as euer before.

By this the absurditie of the *Appendix-maker* appeareth also, in so often obtruding to his reader, that all matters are declared and determined by his Holines, who neuer had seene the priests their bookes, nor heard them, what they had to say: neither can this author shew out of that *Breue*, that it is declared or determined by his Holines, whether the priests (who according to the Cannons of holy Church, refused to admit a Prelate instituted, as is pretended by the See Apostolicke, but had no letter to shew for his institution from that See) were *schismaticks* or no. Neither can this fellow shew out of that *Breue*, that it is declared or determined, whether those priests, who so refused that Prelate, were for that cause *excommunicated*, or lost their faculties, or could loose them, by defending their innocencie by any law or edict, which could be made by the Archpr. or at the will, and pleasure of a Prelate, who had his Authoritie not as an Ordinary, but as Sub-delegate, to whom was prescribed a set forme of proceeding, in the inflicting of such penalties, as he had power to inflict vpon those, who should deserue them. In fine it appeareth not in that *Breue*, that the chiefe doers in this controuersie are once named, or their facts censured: only a booke of theirs is suppressed, to wit, their *treatise of schisme*, but not condemned, as false, or erroneous, whereby any iudgement might be made, whether the accusation were iust, or not iust, or how the Catholicks, who were most violently caried against the priests, might be resolved vpon the point in controuersie: yet is not this fellow ashamed to publish.



publish it vnto the world in this maner. So as now those matters being thus declared, & determined by his Holines, we hope that euery good Catholicke man, and especially our brethren, that are also Gods Priests, will enter into themselves, &c.

The like boldnesse doth this Author vse, and libertie in the next sentence, where he wisheth the good Catholike man, and especially his brethren, to ponder well the *absurditie of spirit, and speech proceeding thereof discovered in those their later bookes, beyond all measure unfitting for men of our vocation*: that is to say, the booke to the Inquisition, and *The hope of peace*, against which two bookes this Appendix is written, and because he will seeme to say nothing, but what he meaneth to proue; *this answer* (saith he) shall principally consist in laying before them their owne sayings in these bookes, with a word, or two of aduertisement, to make more deepe, and full reflexion thereof. Now then it resteth that he performe as much, and that he deale, both honestly, in relating the words out of these bookes, and charitably in giuing his aduertisements.

The first of these later bookes, which he taxeth for *absurditie of spirit, and speech*, is intituled, *The hope of peace*, by laying open such doubts, and manifest vntruths, as are diuulged by the Archpriest in his letter, or answer to the bookes, which were published by the priests. But before he toucheth it, he discovereth a little of his owne spirit, and speech, which whether it be not more absurd, then that, at which he carpeth, an indifferent Reader may iudge, while he chargeth his brethren (as he termeth them) with *fond, & passionate proceedings in these their distracted agonies*. In this title are 5. things noted. First that it is a contrary meanes to make, or hope for peace, to impose on the Archpriest and diuulge against him calumniationes of so manifest vntruths, which can neuer be prooued. Secondly, that the Archpriest is here named by contempt without any reuerence, or respect at all. Thirdly, that there is mention of doubts, the Archpriest hauing no doubt in the points he touched in his letter. Fourthly, that the Archpriests letter is termed an answer to the former two bookes. Fifthly, that they call themselves the priests, being but a fewe diuided men from the rest, whose doings are utterly misliked and detested by the better and greater part of our Clergie.

To



To the first, replie is made, that it is the most ordinary and surest meanes to make, or hope peace, to open doubts, and vntruethes, which is perfourmed in *The hope of peace*, without imposing any thing vpon the Archpriest but what is there promised; and this author himselfe thought so well of those meanes himselfe, as in the preface he tooke occasion to hope, *rest, quietnesse, peace, and obedience*: because as he sayd, *these matters were declared, and determined by his Holinesse*, and there is no man can doubt, but that the cause of this second diuision was the not laying open of such *doubts* and *manifest vntrueths* about the slander of *schisme*: which if it had been determined, when the first *Breue* came, those wicked proceedings of the Archpriest and his seditious adherents had neuer ministred any occasion to make a second *Breue*.

To the second there is this reply made, that if these words, *the Archpr.* imply a contempt, then he is very often cōtemptuously vsed by the author of this *Appendix* both in the preface, and the discourse, where we reade the said words, *The Archpriest*, yea sometime concerning the Pope himselfe, *the Popes Breue*, *the Popes authoritie*: and where speech is of the *Prouinciall*, and *Generall* of the Iesuits fol. 17. *Fa Parsons* letter is cited, wherein there is no more *reuerence*, and *respect*, then this, *the Prouinciall and Generall themselues*, which who will dare to say are named by contempt?

To the third, replie is made, that although to men of sense there is nothing in the Archpriests letter, which should moue any *doubt*, yet the letter being caried about, and presented to the simpler sort, there are many things which might mooue *doubts* in them, and particularly in the very first beginning the Archpriest doth shew some doubt, where he sayth, (speaking of the bookes) *perhaps neuer meant to bee presented to him*, (his Holines) And the fourth principall point which he toucheth, is touched as a matter in doubt, *for it is* (sayth he, speaking of the supposed *schisme*) *but a matter of opinion, and therefore not worthy to make a matter of contention, which part soeuer was true*.

To the fourth I answere, that the Archpriests letter is not absolutely called *an answer* to the bookes, but a *letter*, or *answere*, as may be seen in the title of the booke: but if it had been cal-



led *an answer*, it was so christned before this booke was written, and the Archpriest himselfe vseth the same word: for not farre from the beginning of his letter thus we reade, *and therefore* (sayth he) *no other answer shall be sent now but this.*

To the fifth I answer, that they vsed the name of priests, to distinguish betweene the Iesuits and them, the controuersie being principally betweene them, as may appeare by the groundworke of all this controuersie, to wit, the slanderous tongues, and penne of the Iesuits in the infamie of *schisme*. Secondly, if the controuersie shall be sayd to be onely among the priests, the name of priests will most fitly be applyed to them, who haue behaued themselues as became priests, and the fewnes of the number can be no barre vnto them, howsoeuer their doings are *misliked, and detested by the greater part of the Clergie*, which part, if it were the author of this Appendix (as it seemeth content to beare the name) it might with more humilitie haue left out these wordes, speaking of themselues, *the better part.*

After that he hath canuassed the title of the booke, hee descanteth vpon the Scripture, which is prefixed vnto it, *Veritatem tantum, & pacem diligite*: that is, *trueth onely and peace doe you loue*: and he telleth his Reader, that the priests do impugne peace and trueth: and this latter point hee prooueth, because the booke is said to be *imprinted at Frankfort by the heires of D. Turner*: whereas (sayth he) *the booke is knowne to haue bene printed at London by the fauour of the Bishop, and permission of his Pursuants.* This argument hath beene often solued before, and the folly thereof discovered, it being an vsuall matter among honest men (if *Fa. Parsons* may be counted an honest man) to set out bookes as printed in one place, which are printed in another; and the thing it selfe neither being of that qualitie, that it can induce any man into error, and no iust cause wanting, why such a point should be concealed. It was neuer heard of, before *the absurditie of this spirit* appeared, that such exceptions were taken against a booke. Saint Peter did in a manner date his first Epistle from *Babylon*: *Salutat vos Ecclesia, quæ est in Babylone*: the Church (sayth he ending his Epistle) *which is in Babylon saluteth you*: and no man doubteth, but that he was then in Rome, and meant



meant no other then to write from Rome. And shall wee say, that hee gloried in vnttering an vntrueth? But whereas this fellow affirmeth, that this booke was printed in *London by the fauour of the Bishop and permission of his Purseuants*: he discovereth that, which was neuer known vnto him, who paid for the printing thereof, as I haue beene before very credibly informed. But to let passe these friuolous toyes and foolish exceptions, which might be quitted with a reall falshood, commonly vsed by the author of this *Appendix* in publishing his libels, vnder the name of the vnited priests, who poore fooles must beare all the blame thereof, and runne thereby into perpetuall infamie, I will shew what exceptions this absurd fellow taketh at the preface of the booke, which he impugneth.

Out of the Preface hee hath picked a fewe sentences, out of which hee gathereth certaine notes worthy himselfe: as first, that they are called *the priests, as if they were either far the greater part, or the most eminent priests of all England*. Secondly, that they affirme, how that they haue set forth two bookes in the necessarie defence of their good name and fame, which necessitie he affirmeth to be no other, then *the force of their owne passions*, and telleth a tale of King *Edward* (as he sayth) or *some former King*. Thirdly he noteth a comicall veine in the beginning of the Preface, and that the priests doe descric a stage spirit, by mentioning *fooles and physicians, and morning and euening meditations*, which hee affirmeth that they did vse, when they were vnder the Iesuits. Fourthly he noteth more of this kind, mingled also with some sauour of impietie in these words of the Preface. *The Iesuits might haue played with their Canons, vpon such as resisted the Apostolicall decrees, &c. And a little after Fa. Lyster being alwayes ready with his Canon nulli fas est, &c. Here loe, who seeth not, that these men (sayth he) by scoffing at Canons (which are nothing els but Ecclesiasticall rules) meane to liue vnder no rule at all, &c.* Fifthly hee noteth, that the same *Fa Lyster*, who cited that Canon, read both *Philosophie and Diuinitie* with great commendations in other countreys. Sixtly hee citeth a sentence, of which he misliketh both the style, and the phrase.

Concerning the first note or exception, sufficient hath bene said, and how that the greater part in a communitie may be



mislead, and the part which hath iustice for it, deserueth the title of the whole, for that in Courts of conscience and iustice, the faultie (although otherwise far exceeding in number) is accounted either the lesser part, or no part at all, but onely as a faction against them, who haue the trueth on their sides: which hath bene declared by the Cardinals of the *Inquisition*, and his Holines also to be with the lesser part of the priests. To the second exception it is replied, that no man of any sense can deny, but that the most impious slanders, which the Iesuits, the Archpr. and their seditious adherents did raise against the priests were a great necessitie for the priests to set out their books, yea after their appeale was made vnto his Holines: because these fellowes desisted not from their wickednes, but persecuted the Appellants, and the more eagerly for this fact of their appellation, labouring in all places to defame them, and abridging them of their charitie, as they call it, which otherwise such of the Appellants, as either in prison, or elsewhere are in want, were wont to receiue for their reliefe. And as for his tale of King *Edward the Confessor*, or *some former King*, it is not his fortune, as I thinke, to thriue with his tales. First because how commendable soeuer a touch of a comicall vaine may be in serious or graue matters, yet it is absurd in him who shall vse it, and yet finde fault therewith in the very same matters, as this fellow doeth in his thirde exception which I haue noted. Secondly, because his tales are returned vpon himselfe much more fitly, then he deliuereth them against his aduersary. He remembred a story that *is recorded in one of our ancient writers, either of King Edward the Confessor, or some former King who being complained vnto by a certaine woman with great vehemencie, that an other had called her skold, she being conuented, and not able to proue it, she was cōdemned to prison, but she replied saying: well then I must to prison not for that I haue spoken vntrueth, but onely for lacke of a witnes. Wherewith the king being mooued saide, In good sooth I thinke you haue reason, and that in this matter I may bee your witnesse, for that this woman in accusing you, and defending herselfe, hath prooued her selfe a very skold in deed. Thus saide the King, and the parable needeth no great application: for mee thinke euery man will vnderstand it, and our breithren are like to haue*  
the



the same successe in the ende, if wee bee not deceiued, which wee leaue to the euent, and triall. Thus farre the tale of the skold, and in the very next wordes he blameth a Comicall veine in so graue a subiect, as this is. But to the skold. This Authour leaueth *the parable* (as he termeth it) to euery man to vnderstand it; and if it be not vnderstood as he would it should, he is to blame himselfe, would propound such *parables*, and would not expound them. This *skold* I take to be *Fa. Lyster the Iesuit*, and in him his fellow Iesuits, and the Archpr. with his faction, who maintained that *treatise of schisme*, and infinite other slanders, and wicked actions against the other priests, who being many wayes put to silence, as hauing their complaint by appellation not admitted, and commanded not to name it, wherein they had bene most iniuriously slandered, do somewhat resemble therein the woman, who could not proue the skolde to be a skolde. But if king *Edward the Confessor*, or any other king (if not so saint-like, yet not altogether senselesse) would take that *treatise Of schisme*, and attentiuely reade it, he cannot but see a singular president for all the skolds, which should for euer after succeed. First, the very title of the treatise doth shew, that it was made by a skolde; for this it is, *Aduersus factiosos in Ecclesia, Against the factious in the Church*: and this word, *factious*, is often vsed, but because it is not significant enough, in the third paragrasse toward the end, thus he proceedeth, *Sed adeant nugaces isti, ac in theologia homunculi vllam rempublicam, &c.* that is, *But let these triflers, and pigmies in diuinitie, goe to any common wealth, &c.* Who would haue thought that *F. Lyster* a Iesuite would haue growen to such an insolencie against priests, whereof some were his fellowes in studies, some so farre his ancients, as they might haue bene his Masters in diuinitie, and many more of them might haue excelled him (were he a greater man in diuinitie then he is) if they would haue omitted their course of charitie in helping their needy countrey, and stayed to haue followed a course of more knowledge, of which the Apostle said most truely in him, *Scientia inflat, knowledge puffeth vp?* and it hath made him so to swell, as he most insolently, and contemptuously cōceiueth of others, as of *pigmies in diuinitie*, who perchance admire him as much, that he is become such a



monster informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum, euill fashioned, and huge, and one who hath his sight taken from him. Yea the poore fooles, who had hid themselues with a marueilous wise, and sweet reseruatiō of themselues in a tub of hony, as it seemed vnto them, were fetched out by the eares in his 4. paragraph, where he concludeth against them in this maner: *Ergo in regnum Christi Neutrales rebelles sunt, Therefore the Newters are rebels against the kingdome of Christ.* But in the 5. paragraph he layeth on load, and vseth (as his blindnesse would suffer him) this Canon of the Church against the Priests, *Nulli fas est,* and when he hath cited the Cannon, he concludeth thus, *Ergo factiosi isti prostrati sunt ruina sua dolore, eo quod cōtraiuerint decretis Apostolicis:* That is, *Therefore these factious are ouerthrowne with the grieffe of their owne fall, because they haue gone against Apostolicall decrees.* But if any man should haue asked him for these Apostolicall decrees, where they went, how, when, or by whom they had bene gone against, he would haue told no tale of any other then a Cardinals letter, which none but a skold, to serue his turne, would euer haue called an *Apostolicall decree*: for other there was none vntill the 6. of April following. In the 6. paragraph among other skolds tricks he doeth most liuely represent himselfe in the obiection, which he putteth to himselfe. *Sed dicent fortasse, Pontificem hac decreuisse non sano aliorum consilio incitatum. O mendacium: Quid? numquid factiosis istis licebit in re grauissima tam impune, tamquē impudenter mentiri? proferant si verū est suos testes, ac alia argumenta, quae sapientem conuincant. De stultis enim nō ita curandū est, quid sentiant, quidue effutiāt.* That is, *But they may say perchance, that the Pope was moued by the euil counsell of others to decree this. O lie: What? shal it be lawful for those factious to ly so scotfree, & so impudētly in a matter of most great weight? If that be true, let them bring forth their witnesses or other argumētis which might conuince a wise man, for as for fooles, it is not to be regarded what they thinke or tattle: & in the seuenth paragraph he concludeth in this manner. Nunc vos appello factiosos, &c. vos rebelles estis, schismatici estis, &c. Now to you factious, &c. yee are rebels, yee are schismatickes, and are fallen from the Church and spouse of Christ: ye haue troden vnder your feet the obedience which ye doe owe to the highest Bishop: ye haue offended against all humane faith,*  
and



and authoritie in reiecting a morall certeintie in a morall matter: ye haue runne violently into excommunication and irregularitie: yee haue lost the faculties, by which yee ought to haue gained soules to Christ: ye haue giuen such a scandall to all the godly, as ye are become infamous in euery mans mouth. What shall I say more? yee haue so offended by your disobedience against the chiefest vicar of Christ, and against Christ himselfe the Iudge and reuenger, as we may say against you with the Prophet Samuel, *Quasi peccatum ariolandi est repugnare, & quasi scelus idolatrie nolle acquiescere*, (that is) It is as the sinne of southsaying, to repugne, and as Idolatry not to hearken. See I pray you, that ye are nothing better then Southsayers, and Idolaters, and ye who did not heare the Church speaking vnto you by the highest Bishop, are as Ethnicks and Publicanes. And here I make an end of saying, very earnestly beseeching the very great God, that he will flow into your minds the very force of his grace, lest that being thrust into eternall destruction, with Ethnicks and Idolaters, yee abide immortall paines for this your so great disobedience and scandal. To mine vnderstanding, euery man wil say, that the priests had reason to thinke the Iesuits and the Archpriest, with their seditious adherents, to be scolds & most wicked slanderers, and that in this matter the readers themselues might be sufficient witnesses for the priests: for that this Iesuite, and the rest his partners in him, in accusing the priests, and defending themselues, haue prooued themselues very scolds in deed: and the parable cannot be better applyed, as I doe vnderstand it, and the Iesuits with their adherents are like to haue but badde successe in the end, if I am not deceiued, which I leaue to the euent and triall: yet one thing in the meane while, to requite his tale of K. Edward, I thought good to aduertise, that King Edward, not the Confessor, or a former king, but a good religious king of that name, who liued long after K. Edward the Confessor, and was the third of that name after the conquest, amongst other enormous offenders, which hee desired to haue grieuously punished, or rooted out of his Realme, as great disturbers of peace, &c. *Falsarum querelarum assumptores, manutentores, & fautores eorum* are numbred, that is, beginners or followers of false accusations, and their mainteiners, and fauourers against whom this decree was made by Iohn Stratford Bishop of Canterburie in a Counsel.

Superno



*Superno Dei munere, &c. unde nos pia mentis dicti regis, inuitatione laudabili excitati, audaciam huiusmodi perfidorum compescere cupientes, omnes malefactores predictos taliter in posterum in nostra Cantuariensi prouincia delinquentes, scienter, presenti auctoritate Consilij maioris excommunicationis sententiam volumus, & pronuntiamus incurrere ipso facto: that is, Wee mooued thereunto by the laudable solicitation of the godly minde of the saide king, and desiring to aswage the audaciousnesse of these perfidious people, wee will by the authoritie of this present Counsell, and pronounce that all the aforesaid malefactors, who shall hereafter wittingly so offend, in our prouince of Canterburie, do incurrere ipso facto, maiorem excommunicationem. And so we leaue these false accusers of their brethren of schisme, rebellion, disobedience, &c. and their mainteyners and fauourers, to reflect vpon themselues in what state they liue, and wish them to goe seeke remedie, where it is to be had, and lie no longer wallowing in sinne, which daily increaseth vpon them, by diuers and those many very sacrilegious actions, for which their affected ignorance will be no excuse.*

To the third exception I answere, that there is not any cause to note any such veine in that place: for who knoweth not, that it is a word in euery mans mouth, *a foole, or a physicion*, and that it may be againe said, that he, who tooke exception hereat, was either a foole, or a physiciā? but how either these words or the next following, to wit, *morning or euening meditations*, are saide to be more fit for a stage, then so graue a subiect as this is, I confesse I doe not vnderstand, vnlesse this authour peraduenture hath gotten somewhat by such exercises, and thereupon framed his conceite of a stage, where the deeper the dissimulation is, and either true or false matters best counterfeited, there fooles and their money doe part most ioyfully. But marke I pray you, what cause this fellow had, to except in these tearmes: these were the words against which the exception is taken, *people of all professions, fooles and physicians, make vp their morning and euening meditations with the most vnciuill tearmes, which they may deuise against them* (the Priests.) The holy Ghost by the Prophet Dauid, vsed the like phrase against the persecutors of Christ, and his Church: *Quare fremuerunt Gentes, & populi meditati sunt*



*sunt inania? why haue the Gentiles bene intraged, and the people meditated vaine things?* by which it is euident that although some meditations may be good, and to good end, some may be most wicked, yea and wickednesse it selfe, as the holy Ghost affirmeth by the mouth of the same Prophet, *iniquitatem meditatus est in cubili suo, he hath meditated wickednesse in his bed:* and when morning and euening meditations were thus mentioned, neither the holy Ghost, nor any good spirit thought it a *veine more fit for a stage*, then any graue subiect.

To the fourth I answer, that the Canons of holy Church were not scoffed at, as this fellow doth most maliciously inform his reader, but the Iesuite was blamed for the euill applying thereof, as may be seene in the discourse: and the reason hereof is giuen, for that the Canon, which he applieth against the priests, speaketh onely of such as doe not obey *Apostolicall decrees*, and the question or controuersie betweene the Iesuites and their adherents on the one part, and the other priests on the other part, was, whether they were bound to giue credite to a *Cardinals letter*, for their subiecting themselues to one, who had nothing els to shew for the authority which he challenged. A man may admire an asse, when he seeth him vnder a huge burden, who yet will laugh heartily to see him take a harpe in his pawes, to play thereon, or sing vnto it: and yet will another be very iustly iudged an asse, who will affirme, that this man laughed at the harpe, and not rather at the asse: yet wil he haue his reader to conceiue, that the priests did scoffe at the Canon, yea more then this, that *hereby it is apparant that they meane to liue vnder no rule at all.* These are the *aduertisements*, of which hee spake in the end of his preface, to make more deepe reflection of the sayings in the priests bookes, by which he hath made knownen also the *absurditie of his owne spirit and speech.*

To the fifth note it is replyed, that it was an euill turne for F. Lister the Iesuite, to come into England to expound the Canon law, or descant thereon, if he read Philosophy, and Diuinitie with great cōmendations in other countreys: for I doubt that he hath so discredited himselfe in taking a *Cardinals letter* for an *Apostolicall decree*, as euery man, who commended him for the other matters, will iudge that not onely he was franticke,



when he writ his treatise of *Schisme*, but as many other also as did applaud it.

To the sixt note which he maketh, no other answer is to be giuen, then that it might please him to reade it ouer againe, and shew some particular matter which he iudgeth blame worthy: for diuers sober men haue read it ouer, and ouer, and they iudge the style and phrased most meete for the matter, and the matter most necessary to be knowen.

The *Appendix-maker* hauing discovered how litle he had to say of the preface, to the *hope of peace*, now he commeth to the answer which was made to the Archpriests letter, but first telleth his reader, that the booke to his Holines, and the English booke, which were the cause of the Archpriest his complaint, or aduertisement, (as he saith) were *inuectiue and scandalous libels*, and that the English booke contained many *temerarious, false, and scandalous propositions, as well in matter of doctrine, as about the actions of Superiours*, to all which answer hath beene made in the reply to the *Apologie*, the doctrine of the priests prooued Catholike, and the obstinate maintainers of the contrary declared to be no better then heretickes.

In this answer to the *hope of peace*, the authour discovereth an egregious audaciousnesse, as well in making a shew, that he can answer that, which in very trueth cannot with any reason be answered, as also in threaning ouermuch kindnes vpon the priests in mis-citing their words, and making them say that which they neuer said: a silly shift, but necessarily to be vled, when no other is left, to minister at the least a supposed matter to make a booke, which falshood being discovered, the *Appendix* is fully answered: for as appeareth by the preface, this *his answer* shall principally consist in laying before the Priests, their owne sayings, with a word or two of aduertisement.

In the fift leafe, where he beginneth to except against the *hope of peace*, he doth falsely tell his reader, that the name of a *rocke* was applied to the Archpriest in this discourse: for the discourse speaketh of *rockes* in the Archpriests letters, and not as if the Archpriest were the *rocke* himselfe, and because *Dauus* desireth to be instructed, what is ment by *rockes*, in the *hope of peace*, he is to vnderstande that such things are meant, as lie either  
openly,



openly, or more hidden in those letters, in which the *rockes* are said to be, as are in the Seas, vpon which ships are violently caried or doe runne infortunately, when either the stormes are too great, or the Pilot vnskillfull.

In the sixt leafe exception is taken against the application of Scripture which our Sauour vsed, *if any of you asketh bread of his father, will he giue him a stone?* but here is not one word in answer to that which was applyed, to wit, that *M. Blackwell* sought by all meanes to driue vs to say against our owne soules, that we were *Schismatickes*, yet crieth he out that *passion* ouerbearcth *iudgement and modestie*, and all other good respects.

In the same sixt leafe he threatneth the priests downe, that they should say, and not deny, that the Archpriest confessed, that the instructions, which he first shewed, as from Rome, were not made in Rome, but some in England, *by vertue of those, which came from Rome, giuing him authoritie to make particular orders or instructions, &c.* alas the goodman is much mistaken, for the two priests here named, to wit, *M. Collington* and *M. Charnocke* (who will giue ouer the office of accusers, and witnesses, for which they are here challenged, to *M. Blackwells* owne conscience, where this poore shift will not helpe him) neuer sayd that *M. Blackwell* had such a shift at that time, but being taken in the falsifying his instructions, or propounding other instructions in place of such, as he said were annexed to his Commission, simply confessed the fraude, adding that indeed some of them were of his owne making, and all this story of *a vertue from Rome*, was deuised afterward and set out for a poore satisfaction for his former falshood. For if he had had al the authoritie in the world, by vertue whereof hee might haue made instructions, yet was it a false tale, to say that instructions made in England were made in Rome, or annexed to his Commission, which he pretended to haue receiued from Rome.

In the 7 leafe this fellow raileth at *the hope of peace*, because there are not other accusations mentioned against the Archpr. as though the poore man had not ynough of one, and in this his *absurditie of spirit, and speech*, he telleth in a parenthesis a most egregious knowen fitten: for (saith he) *it seemeth they M. Collington, and M. Charnocke were sent to him (M. Blackwell) of purpose*



pose to catch him in his words. And all the townerung of it, that *M. Blackwell* had conuented *M. Collington*, and *M. Charnocke*, vpon which speech *M. H. H.* one of the first Lay factious, was called the Sumner, for that he was the man, who by *M. Blackwells* appointment, hunted vp and downe to bring *M. Collington* and *M. Charnocke* vnto him, as after two dayes seeking he did: but the new illuminates must belecue all things which this companion vttereth. And this much for his *parenthesis*. Now concerning the principall matter here handled, this fellow is as false in repeating it: For thus he telleth his tale, *About an hereticall proposition, said to be vttered by him, in that he told them, that they could not appeale from him in some points.* The priests haue affirmed, that *M. Blackwell*, notwithstanding that he was diuerst times admonished by *M. Collington* and *M. Charnocke* of the danger thereof, persisted in this proposition *that the Priests could not appeale from him to the Sea Apostolick*, and these wordes, *in some points* are foisted in by this author, and kindnesse threatned vpon the priests, that they should say that hee said so, whereas if he had, he had said more then truth, hauing no colour therefore, because he had no cause subdelegated vnto him, nor he put in any authoritie to iudge any matter, with this clause, *Appellatione remota*. But this helps to gall the new illuminated, as also that contemptible conclusion, *and laying all other arguments, proofes, and probabilities aside, will ponder onely but the difference betweene the accused, and the accuser in this case, shall quickly satisfie himselfe*; for *M. Collington* and *M. Charnocke* were then knowen to be two honest priests, and *M. Blackwell* was but one at the most, and it will be apparantly knowen, that they haue patiently suffered much iniury, for their mainteyning a iust quarrell, and he will be conuincd to haue bene a long time an intruder, or an vsurper, and afterward an abuser of his authoritie, when he had it, against them without iust cause, when they shalbe cleared from *Schisme, rebellion, and disobedience*, which he and his adherents haue most maliciously, if not ignorantly obiected, and caused them to be persecuted therefore.

In the same leafe this poore fellow inculcatheth his *Hol. confirmation* of this authority, as though that were a conuincing argument, that there was truth vsed either for the setting vp thereof,



thereof, or the mainteyning of it, whereas it is well knownen to those, who will know ought in these matters, that his Holines may be misinformed, and thereupon do that, which may be afterward recalled, as no doubt this will be, which is vrged in the same lease, out of the second *Breue* of the 17. of *August* 1601. *Sanè vestro superiori vos submittere, atque ei obedire debeatis*, Truly you ought to haue submitted your selues to your Superior, and to haue obeyed him. For as I haue before shewed, he was at that time no other then an intruder, vntill he had his confirmation from the Sea Apostolicke, and he was to be punished for his audacioufnes, and al who receiued him at that time, and since, the matter hauing bene examined by the Cardinals of the *Inquisition*, 20. *July* 1602, the priests are cleared from *disobedience*.

In the 8. lease he citerh two sentences out of the *hope of peace* which tend to this effect, that the testimony of one Cardinall, doeth not bind in conscience to beleue a thing preiudiciall to a third: but he answereth not one of those authors, which are there cited for prooffe hereof, pag. 32. and 33. He telleth also his reader that when the first *Breue* came, the priests seemed to accomodate themselves for a time, yet soone after they brake forth againe, and fell to writing, and examining the said Cardinals letters, more then before, *reiecting and discrediting the same with all maner of contempt*, and so they doe now in these later *Libels*, as though his Holines had neuer allowed or confirmed them. But he concealeth the cause of his writing, which was the Iesuits reuiuing the slander of *Schisme*, and the Archpr. his furthering thereof with a resolution pretended to come from *Rome*, to that purpose: which wickednes of theirs did driue the priests to declare the state of the question, as it was before the *Breue* came, and to proue that they were not *Schismatickes* in that time, in which they were falsly said to haue bene such, and in this doing they were to abstract from the Popes *Breue*, whose after comming could not make the former cause better, or worse, except only in this respect, that it conuincd, that the Archpr. was an intruder, who would exercise any authoritie, to which he was elected, or deputed by the Sea Apostolicke, before he had his letters from the said Sea in confirmation thereof. And



it may appeare very euidently, because in that *Breue* there are not any such wordes, as the Iesuits and Archpriest doe often vrge, *Valida ab initio*, (that is) that these things concerning the authority were of force frō the beginning, but *valida existere* (saith the *Breue*) & fore, That is to say, now and hereafter to be of force, as may be seene in the first *Breue*, which beareth date the 6. of April 1599.

In the ninth leafe he citeth a sentence out of the 34. page, out of the which he noteth a restraint of the protectors authoritie to the court of Rome, and also authoritie to demurre vpon the Popes letters: for the first (sayth he) they say that the office of a Protector stretcheth not it selfe any further, then the Court of Rome, which they prooue by the wordes of the Popes *Breue*, it selfe, *Nationis Anglicana apud nos & Apostolicam sedem Protector*: that is, Protector of the English Nation with vs, and with the Sea Apostolike. And to helpe the matter they doe adde of their owne, in their English translation, the word Here which is not in the Latine, to the end it may seeme to tie the Protectors office to the place it selfe, which is most absurd to any man, that will consider the meaning of these words, which is, that the Protectors office is giuen, ouer any nation, order of religion, or the like to protect, or defend them in all occasions with his Holinesse, and his successors, understood by the words, Sea Apostolike, whether it be in the Court of Rome, or out of Rome: for when the Pope lay at Auignon in France (for examples sake) yet was the office of Protector also in vse. And when Cardinall Caietane our late Protector was Legate in France, and Polonia, his office of Protectorship ceased not whensoever hee would deale in any matter &c. and this is sufficient for this first point, which seemeth to include both folly, and audacitie.

In this story were first to be answered, why *apud nos* is thus translated, *Here with vs*: But I wil leaue this to Grammer boies, who know that this word *apud* doth import a place consequently in the very nature of the signification, and as I thinke neuer vntill this day was this translation iudged faultie, *est apud me*, he is here with me: or *est apud illum*, hee is there with him: and it cannot but argue a greater will in the Appendix-maker, then power to finde a fault. The rest of the story is as absurd: for who did euer say, that a Protector did leaue his office when he was out  
of



of Rome? the priests words are, that *it did not stretch further then the Court of Rome*, which are true, although the protector be in *Polonia*: for although hee be there in person, yet may hee deale by letters in the Court of Rome, and at Rome, and all this while, although the man who hath authority be farre from Rome, yet his authoritie in that kind stretcheth it selfe to deale no further then in the Court of Rome. And put the case that the Pope should goe againe to *Auignon*, and come no more at Rome, this fellow will not denie, that he remaineth still Bishop of Rome, and that as Bishop of that Sea hee gouerneth the Church, and consequently there must be the Court of Rome, and not in Rome, for that (as I take it) the Court is where the prince is, and this way also are the words true, which were vsed that *the Protectors office, stretched not it selfe any further then the Court of Rome*, wheresoeuer that Court is kept. And this is sufficient for to shew the folly and audacitie of the *Appendix-maker*, who would take vpon him to correct what it seemeth he vnderstood not. *In hoc Consistorio &c. In this Consistory*, (that is the College of Cardinals, or the Popes Counsel saith, *Zechi de statu Illust. D. Card. Num. 9.*) euery Prouince, and congregation of regulars, and kings, haue their fathers gardians, which are called Protectors, who in the Consistorie doe propound the elections, and other causes of the Prouince committed vnto them, and answere to those who oppose against them.

And for the second (sayth he) about demurring vpon his Holines letters, we iudge it to be of much more importance, and far more perillous, yea temerarious doctrine: for if it be lawfull for any man, as our brethren here auerre, to demurre vpon his Holinesse letters, with minde to giue a reasonable cause thereof afterwards; what end will there be of strife? what obedience? what resignation of willes, and iudgements to our Superiours commandements? &c. See how this ignorant companion vrgeth it, as perillous and temerarius doctrine, notwithstanding he was shewed in *The hope of peace*, that it was most Catholike doctrine, and according to the ordinances of holy Church, and he was referred for his learning to the order of Pope *Alexander the third, Cap. Si quando de Rescriptis*, where the Pope writeth in this manner to the Bishop of *Bauenna*, *Si quando, &c. If at any time we direct any thing to*  
your



your brotherhood, which may seeme to exasperate your minde, you ought not to be troubled; and afterward, hauing considered vpon the qualitie of that businesse for which you are written vnto, either reuerently fulfill our commandement, or signifie some reasonable cause by your letters, why you cannot fulfill it, for we will beare it patiently, if you shall not doe that which hath been, or shall be suggested vnto vs by euil insinuation. There is in the same place another saying of the same Pope cited, *Cap. Cum teneamur de prebendis, & dignit.* to the same effect, and this poore fellow not being able to make any answer hereunto, telleth his *blind obedient* a tale of obedience, as though this Pope *Alexander* had exhorted men to disobedience, when hee told them, that they should giue him a cause by their letters, why they did not or could not do as they were commanded by him.

In the eleuenth leafe for want of matter, in the hope of peace, he falleth into the *Copies of discourses*, and according to the erroneous vaine, in which he was in the *Apologie*, hee excepteth against that, which is said by the Priests, that *authoritie is not an infallible rule of truth in all who haue authoritie*, and out of that which is said, that *but one vpon earth is warranted from error, and not he in all things*. And hereupon he inferreth thus: how (sayth he) can our English people assure themselves, but that this institution of the Archpriest was one of the things wherein he might erre? By what Law, Logicke, or Diuinitie can this fellow shew, that his Holines cannot vpon false information doe a greater matter, then the confirmation of an Archpriest, in the authoritie of an Archpriest? It was woont to be no *temerarious or perilous doctrine*, to affirme, that a Pope could commit a sinne, which is a greater matter, then not to be well aduised in the institution of an Archpriest: for the sinne groweth of frailtie in the man: and euill aduise or information, by which the Archpriest is instituted in his office, may come from another, in whome his Holinesse may repose a trust, and be deceiued. All the rest, which followeth in this eleuenth leafe, is often answered in the priests bookes, and lately more at large by M. Doctor *Ely*, in his notes vpon the *Apologie*, and by M. *Collington* in his iust defence, &c. and there is a reason giuen in the place, quoted in the 11. leafe, of that which is there brought out of the hope of peace. And the fault



fault or disgrace (which this fellow would should light vpon his Holinesse concerning the institution of the Archpriest in that manner that it was) the Priests haue alwayes layd vpon the informers, who procured such dealing as was, in a matter of so great moment: neither haue the priests challenged the ordination at any time for a matter of plot, as proceeding from his Holinesse, but as it proceeded from the Iesuits, who were known to attend principally to such matters, and were the sole actors in making this ordination, and moderating thereof, as hath more apparantly since beene scene: and at the very first they did so grossely interesse themselves therein, as the Archpriest must needs haue one of his instructions, not to doe any thing of moment without the aduise of the Superiour of the Iesuits here in England. Although now in a consult in the *Inquisition* it is adiudged to be taken away, notwithstanding his Holines former confirmation thereof in the first *Breue* the 6. of *April* 1599. which also conuinceth, that his Holinesse may doe that, which without offence may afterward be vndone.

In the thirteenth leafe this author repeateth more matter out of the *Copies of discourses*: for *the hope of peace* ministreth little matter for him to speake against, and the booke to the *Inquisition* much lesse, as it should seeme by this *Appendix*: but it is sufficient that there is a pamphlet intituled, *An Appendix for the examination of these two bookes*, it skilleth not how little thereof is handled therein: but let vs see what this geare is. They adde (sayth hee) in the same page, that by the opinion of diuers men of iudgement in the lawes of our countrey, this our case may and will be drawen within the compasse of the law of *Præmunire*, loe here these men seeme to be counsellors that can say it may, and will be drawen, for that perchance themselves had suggested it against other Catholickes. But doe yee marke the reason why it may and will be so drawen? because, say they, it is an externall iurisdiction, brought into the realme against the will and notice of the prince and countrey. doe you not see his Holines Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction wholly here excluded by these good men, as externall, vnlesse it be allowed by the prince or countrey, notwithstanding any difference in religion? And doe we marueile, that these men are fauoured by the Counsel, that will publish such things in their behalfe against their owne religion?



A marueilous story, and stoutly vrged. If the holy Ghost himselfe should say as once he sayd by the Prophet *David*, *Dixit insipiens in corde suo non est Deus*: The foole said in his heart there is no God: would this companion chalenge the holy Ghost, that he said *there is no God*? yet is it true, that these words proceeded from him, but not proceeding from him as his wordes, but as the words of a foole related by him, they might well be spoken euen by God himselfe. The like case is this of the priests, who affirmed in this place, quoted by this Author, no other matter then this, *By the opinions of diuers men of iudgement in the lawes of our countrey, this our case may and will be drawen within the compasse of an old law, enacted as well by our Catholicke Bishops and Prelates, as by the Prince, aboue 300. yeres agoe, viz. the law of Præmunire*. Is here any assertion of the priests, *that it may and will be drawen*? &c. Haue they not deliuered it in as plaine termes as they may, that it was the opinion of other men? they then are the counsellors, and not the priests, who onely haue related what they said, and this poore fellow sheweth, that his wits were small in this deuice, and that his honestie was much lesse, in that which followeth, *for that perchance themselves had suggested it, against other Catholickes*. Is this a matter of so little weight, as it may be published at a venture? Is the fame of Catholike priests no more to be regarded, but to haue such surmises cast abroad against them? The new illuminated may see if they will, in whose pawes they haue put their soules, and what spitefull guides they haue chosen in place of their spirituall fathers. But concerning this lawe of *Præmunire* mentioned by those, whose words or opinions the priests did onely alledge, there is enough said in the reply to the second Chapter of the *Apologie*: here onely is to be noted, what this author hath since manifested in a late libell, commonly called, *The manifestation of spirits*, concerning this statute: *Wherfore* (sayth he) *a contention being in those dayes, about the collation of benefices and Bishopricks in England, whereof the Popes were wont to dispose for the most part, they concluded in England, after many contentions and disputes, and many sendings forth, and backe to Auignon in Fraunce, where the Popes at that time resided, that such prouisions of benefices should not be sought, nor made from the Pope immediatly, for the time to come,*



come, but onely in England, by consent of the Prince, and confirmati-  
on afterward of the Pope, for the most principall benefices and digni-  
ties: and whosoever should contrary to this, procure promissions imme-  
diatly from the Pope, or any other power or iurisdiction, contrary to  
this law, should incurre the penalties thereof. And this to haue beene  
the onely true meaning and intent of the said law, and law-makers  
that were Catholickes, is euident by all authors, that haue written  
thereof. And in this sense there is no controuersie among vs, for that  
latter Popes haue either agreed thereunto, or permitted the same: and  
we see the like in vse also in other Catholicke countreys at this day, by  
agreement and composition betweene the Sea Apostolike, Princes, and  
Catholike Cleargie.

Can the priests themselves giue a plainer testimony for  
confirmation of the Lawyers their opinions by them cited? But (sayth hee) in this sence there is no controuersie among vs. In  
what sence then is the controuersie? forsooth beside the sence and  
meaning of the law, there hath bene another inuented by heretickes  
and enemies since that time, &c. And in the same sence and signifi-  
cation, being plainely false and hereticall, as you doe see these libellers  
vrge it now against the Archpriest and others, &c.

If one and the same sentence doe beare a Catholike and an  
hereticall sence, it was wont to be iudged according to the par-  
tie his disposition who pronounced it: as for example this sen-  
tence, *Pater maior me est: my father is greater then I am*, beeing  
spoken by a Catholike was taken for Catholike; but being  
spoken by an *Arrian*, was taken for hereticall. Such was the  
guise of Christians before these new reformers appeared in the  
Christian world: but now the world seemeth to be otherwise  
instructed, and Catholike priests how Catholikely soeuer they  
behaue themselves either in words or actions, must be taken  
for hereticks, schismaticks, and such like, at the discretion of such,  
as whose actions (although they are most damnable, as was the  
writing, spreading, and approouing of that most impious trea-  
rise of schisme, and other heathenish proceedings against Ca-  
tholicke priests) must be counted religious, and the authors to  
seeke nothing but the glory of God. And no man must say o-  
therwise, when the very stones in the street are ready to cry out  
of their wickednes, which they haue vled against Cath priests.



A marueilous story, and stoutly vrged. If the holy Ghost himselfe should say as once he sayd by the Prophet *David*, *Dixit insipiens in corde suo non est Deus*: The foole said in his heart there is no God: would this companion challenge the holy Ghost, that he said *there is no God*? yet is it true, that these words proceeded from him, but not proceeding from him as his wordes, but as the words of a foole related by him, they might well be spoken euen by God himselfe. The like case is this of the priests, who affirmed in this place, quoted by this Author, no other matter then this, *By the opinions of diuers men of iudgement in the lawes of our countrey, this our case may and will be drawen within the compasse of an old law, enacted as well by our Catholicke Bishops and Prelates, as by the Prince, aboue 300. yeres agoe, viz. the law of Præmunire*. Is here any assertion of the priests, *that it may and will be drawen*? &c. Haue they not deliuered it in as plaine termes as they may, that it was the opinion of other men? they then are the counsellors, and not the priests, who onely haue related what they said, and this poore fellow sheweth, that his wits were small in this deuice, and that his honestie was much lesse, in that which followeth, *for that perchance themselves had suggested it, against other Catholickes*. Is this a matter of so little weight, as it may be published at a venture? Is the fame of Catholike priests no more to be regarded, but to haue such surmises cast abroad against them? The new illuminated may see if they will, in whose pawes they haue put their soules, and what spitefull guides they haue chosen in place of their spirituall fathers. But concerning this lawe of *Præmunire* mentioned by those, whose words or opinions the priests did onely alledge, there is enough said in the reply to the second Chapter of the *Apologie*: here onely is to be noted, what this author hath since manifested in a late libell, commonly called, *The manifestation of spirits*, concerning this statute: *Wherefore* (sayth he) *a contention being in those dayes, about the collation of benefices and Bishopricks in England, whereof the Popes were wont to dispose for the most part, they concluded in England, after many contentions and disputes, and many sendings forth, and backe to Auignon in Fraunce, where the Popes at that time resided, that such prouisions of benefices should not be sought, nor made from the Pope immediatly, for the time to come,*



come, but onely in England, by consent of the Prince, and confirmation afterward of the Pope, for the most principall benefices and dignities: and whosoever should contrary to this, procure provisions immediately from the Pope, or any other power or iurisdiction, contrary to this law, should incur the penalties thereof. And this to have beene the onely true meaning and intent of the said law, and law-makers that were Catholickes, is evident by all authors, that have written thereof. And in this sense there is no controuersie among vs, for that latter Popes haue either agreed thereunto, or permitted the same: and we see the like in vse also in other Catholicke countreys at this day, by agreement and composition betweene the Sea Apostolike, Princes, and Catholike Cleargie.

Can the priests themselves giue a plainer testimony for confirmation of the Lawyers their opinions by them cited? But (sayth hee) in this sence there is no controuersie among vs. In what sence then is the controuersie? forsooth beside the sence and meaning of the law, there hath bene another inuented by heretickes and enemies since that time, &c. And in the same sence and signification, being plainely false and hereticall, as you doe see these libellers vrge it now against the Archpriest and others, &c.

If one and the same sentence doe beare a Catholike and an hereticall sence, it was wont to be iudged according to the partie his disposition who pronounced it: as for example this sentence, *Pater maior me est: my father is greater then I am*, beeing spoken by a Catholicke was taken for Catholicke; but being spoken by an *Arrian*, was taken for hereticall. Such was the guise of Christians before these new reformers appeared in the Christian world: but now the world seemeth to be otherwise instructed, and Catholike priests how Catholickely soever they behaue themselves either in words or actions, must be taken for hereticks, schismaticks, and such like, at the discretion of such, as whose actions (although they are most damnable, as was the writing, spreading, and approouing of that most impious treatise of *schisme*, and other heathenish proceedings against Catholicke priests) must be counted religious, and the authors to seeke nothing but the glory of God. And no man must say otherwise, when the very stones in the street are ready to cry out of their wickednes, which they haue vied against Cath priests.



The other place noted in this same lease, out of *the copies of discourses*, is there evidently seene to haue been spoken vpon iust cause, and this authour is not able to answere the reason there giuen: neither is it true, which here also he affirmeth, that the *Breue* of the sixt of *April* is called in question whether it were not forged: it is onely sayd, that it was procured by *Fa. Parsons*, God knoweth out of what office: and the reason is there giuen of these speeches, and it is further shewed in the *Replie* to the second chapter of the *Apologie*, how that his Holinesse doth not ordinarily see the *Breués*, which he granteth.

In the 14. and 15. lease this author indeuoureth to satisfie his reader, why he doth often name & insinuate their (the priests) patrons, and their dealings with them in preiudice of Catholike religion, and when he hath spoken his pleasure, he solucth all himselfe in this manner. *And albeit some perhaps may excuse the matter, as though this coniunction were not directly to the hurt of Catholike Religion, yet euery man seeth, that by consequence it is seeing heresie is strengthened by our owne diuision, and voluntary weakening of the Catholike party in their fauour.* But perhaps an honest man will say, that this coniunction is neither directly, nor by consequence to the hurt of Catholike Religion, but rather the vniust prosecution of those, who pretend to be Cath. through which heresie may be strengthened, and those priests tyred, who haue and must deserue best of the Catholike Religion. Neither is this any noueltie in Gods Church, that those who should be nurses of Gods people become cruel vnto them, and they who vsed cruelty, become pious in relieuing the needfull. *S. Hieremie* lamenting the desolation of *Ierusalem*, among other things breaketh out into these wordes: *Sed & lamie nudauerunt mammam, & lactauerunt catulos suos, filia populi mei crudelis, quasi struthio in deserto.* Those creatures who were wont to teare their yong ones in pieces, prepared their teates and gaue them sucke, the daughter of my people is cruel as an Ostrich in the desert. But to returne to our purpose: It is most true, that some priests haue receiued very great fauours of the Magistrates, who notwithstanding they are of a contrary Religion hold it fit, that such haue fauour, as they are well assured doe neither themselves plot, nor combine with others, who haue manifested themselves



to plot against the temporall State, vnder a faire pretence of Religion, and in this ought these priests to thinke themselves most deeply bound vnto them, for that they will take notice of their loyalty: and if M. *Bluet*, as here it is affirmed, haue layd the fault, where it ought to be, what reason hath this fellow to tell his Reader, *that he will easily imagine that this fault is layd vpon the Iesuits, and other, of their side?* Master *Bluet* sayd no such thing, but perchance the matters haue been so grossely handled by these fellowes, as no man can imagine other, and this fellow his guilty conscience maketh him to vtter it, when the Iesuites are not charged therewith. That which this fellowe carpeth at in the *hope of peace* pag. 13. & 14. concerning the casting out of deuils, is plaine enough against him; the onely difficultie is in his owne opinion of the Iesuits, that hearing of the casting out of deuils, he is straight afraid of the Iesuits, as thogh they were not onely deuils, but the onely deuils. That which is brought in, in the *hope of peace*, is brought to shew, that it is not vnlawful to take assistance in a good cause, euen of such, as are otherwise contrary vnto vs. And therefore if there be any impietie in the application of the scripture there brought, the impietie is in this author, who placeth the Iesuits in the deuils roome, and perchance he mistaketh, when he affirmeth, that the Protestants haue them for Religions sake, it being well knowen, that many of the Iesuites friends are highly fauoured who are knowen not to differ one jot in religion from them, and the priests whom this author affirmeth to bee patronized by the Protestant magistrate, are true Catholike priests, and haue so shewed themselves, and are resolute to liue, and die in the Cath. religion: so that there must be some other cause of the hatred, if any be in the Protestant magistrats against the Iesuits, then their religion. But see how he proceedeth: *and they are so resolute* (saith he) *in this holy doctrine, as they doubt not as it were to anathematize any man, that will not stand with them therein; for thus they write a litle after.* Who doth not now expect some sentence out of the *hope of peace* to this effect? yet when it cometh it is of another matter, nothing appertaining to this, but here foisted in by this author to serue his turne. For as it is euident to be seene in the *hope of peace*, this discourse of the casting out of Ie-



suits, as this fellow expoundeth it, was cleane ended; and another passage of the Archpr. his letter taken to bee answered, where he writ in this maner. *It cannot be liked of, that we should write one against another &c.* Whereupon it being first declared, what the Iesuits writ against the priests namely in *the treatise of schisme*, and what infamy grew thereby vnto them, the necessity of writing on the priests side is prooued, and the sentence here alleaged by this authour is vsed, to wit: *And if the priests haue been compelled to this hard choice, as either they sustaine infinite iniuries, and obloquies, or redeeme themselues in this sort, (that is by writing) from so undeserued an oppression, no superiour in the worlde can iustly finde himselfe touched in credit, but such whom the Apostle calleth principes, & potestates mundi, rectores tenebrarum harum.* This sentence being in this sence vsed by the priests, note I pray you how this companion draweth it to another matter. *And is this true in deede good brethren (sayth hee) that no Superiour in the world can thinke himselfe touched in credit by this your dealing with heretickes against Catholickes, but that hee must needs bee accounted a prince of darkenesse? is there no exception at all with you? what if his Holinesse that hath brought you vp &c.* And so hee goeth on in this vaine most idly, and cleane contrary to the intent and purpose of the sentence which hee brought, as may bee seene in *The hope of peace* pag. 16. And yet after all this (which in his modestie he calleth, a *malepart* kinde of writing) he telleth his reader *that some may excuse the matter, as though this coniunction were not directly to the hurt of the Catholicke Religion, yet (saith he) Euery man seeth that by consequence it is, seeing heresie is strengthened by our owne diuision.* If this then be the matter, returne in Gods Name to vnitie, and doe that, which Christians ought to doe in satisfaction to God, and your iniured brethren, who by you, and your meanes haue suffred more indignities and affliction, then euer they had, or could haue of the Protestants.

In the 16. leafe he runneth ouer the reasons, which are giuen for the priests their turning againe, after that they had bene often, and grieuously wounded by the Iesuits, and the Archpr. and playeth his prize vpon this question proposed in *the hope of peace*, page 15. *Is it to be thought, that Gods cause can suffer disho-*  
nour



nour in any course, which is necessary for the recovery of his priests there honoured? But the point he standeth vpon is the scandal, which may grow thereon, and chargeth the priests with a new diuinitie, as though they had neuer heard of the scandal of the Pharises, which Christ himselfe taught vs to contemne. That which this companion, and his fellowes shoote at is, to haue vs learne the diuinitie, which the asse had, who starued to death least by eating any thing which was necessary for his owne life, some other beast might haue misse thereof, and die after it. But himselfe must haue libertie to write, and practise his pleasure without any feare of scandal, for so he writeth in his Preface to the Apologie: which respect of scandal should haue withheld vs wholly from putting pen to paper in this case, if the intemperance of some persons, &c. Possibly this preacher would haue his audience do, as he saith, but not as he doeth, and this is a speciall guids trick, but very farre different from the spirit of our Sauour, and S. Paul whom here he citeth, as earnest forwarners that no scandal be giuen.

In the 17. leafe he citeth a place out of the hope of peace, where was proued, according to the Logicke, which some of the new illuminated had vsed, that all men, who had any trayning vp vnder any master, must subiect himselfe to euery punie Scholemaster. To which (to omit his fallhood in relating the sentence) he telleth his Reader, that our bond is greater to Spiritual, then temporall parents. And so with some of his modest termes he shuffleth vp the matter, as if this had bene the question, or the point there handled, and not rather whether it be fit, that because a man had once a Scholemaster, hee must alwayes be subiect to enery puny Scholemaster during his life. The place is to be seene in the hope of peace, pag. 18. & 19. That which followeth in the 17. leafe concerning a letter of F. Parsons is foolishly answered: for (as there it may seeme) this author saith no otherwise, then was before saide in the place against which he excepteth.

In the 18. leafe that which is affirmed of F. Parsons his bringing in of rules into the English Colledge at Rome contrary to his promise, is to be declared by them whom it concerneth, and were present when it was done, and are to be credited. The other



other matter concerning the new buildings, is here falsely related, *as made by the Iesuits, and namely Fa. Parsons*; All which is foisted in place of this, *But they were not at the charge of the Iesuits, but of the Colledge*. A simple change, but all is to the glory of God: but would a wise man haue talked so vainely of new buildings in the Colledge *by the Iesuits, and namely Fa Parsons*: and in the same place tell his reader of the want which the Colledge had by the discontinuance of a monthly pension, which they once had of Pope Gregory the 13? was it a time for *the Iesuits, and namely Fa. Parsons*, to spend the reuenues of the Colledge vpon making a larger Colledge, when for want of money there could not be scant halfe so many Students, as were sufficiently accomodated, before these new buildings were made? Is this fellow in his right wits, that would thrust such a matter vpon *the Iesuits, and namely Fa. Parsons*, to whose charge this absurditie was not layd in *the hope of peace*, as may be seene page 20. which place is here cited by this author?

That which is affirmed in this 18. leafe out of *the hope of peace* concerning the Cardinall Allen his dislike of the Iesuits, toward his latter end, and also that M. D. Haddocke affirmed himselfe, that he had written to sir Francis Inglefield into Spaine, is againe confirmed. And if D. Haddocke wil deny that he said it, he may mend in his honestie when he will: for what was written, was written from his owne mouth.

In the 19. leafe there is a recapitulation made of that, which is said in *the hope of peace* concerning the Seminaries erected in Spaine by the Iesuits meanes, of which it was saide in respect that there were Seminaries ynow, & the wants of many poore Catholicks were great, that the money imploied in those buildings, might haue bene giuen with more merit to the reliefe of them; And this is heynously taken by this author, but nothing shewed what extraordinary good hath come by those Seminaries. That *Fa. Parsons* entred into other mens labours is confirmed by the testimony of Ma. doctor Cecill, who and another Priest layd the first foundation thereof in Spaine; And as for the subscribing to the title of the *Infanta*, and to certaine blanckes: there are diuers priestes in England, and out of England can testifie it. And what is said in *the hope of peace*



peace page 28. concerning the blotting out of an interrogatory made by *Fa. Parsons* to *M. Charnocke* is most true, although this fellow doe falsifie the place, which he quoteth, for there is no such matter in *the hope of peace*, as this fellow citeth, to wit, *that D. Barret, D. Elie, and others were hindered by Fa. Parsons*; but vnlesse this companion haue one false tricke or other, he feareth his pen will grow too soone out of vre.

In the twentieth leafe this Authour groweth to an ende of his answer to *the hope of peace*, and willing to leaue a remembrance behind him of some notorious matter, hee telleth his Reader, that almost in euery other leafe of both Bookes, that is, as I couceiue, *The hope of peace*, and *The copie of discourses*, (because these onely are in English, the other two were in Latine) when the priests touch the institution of the Arch-priest, they affirme, that it was nothing worth, *for that it was procured vpon false, wicked, deuilish, and impious suggestion of discord betweene the Priests and Catholicks, whereas there was no such indeed.* And thus sayth he, *they repeate againe and againe without all modestie in euery place*: but you must goe looke where: for I haue gone ouer both these bookes againe and againe, and I do not remember that this which hee hath alledged is in any one place of their bookes: and if any man be so well sighted, as to find it in some one place, then shall not this author be vtterly condemned of want of all modestie or honestie. True it is, that surreption is often alledged, to make void the Popes graunt, which both according to the Canon lawes, and al interpreters thereof, doth alwayes suppose this clause: *Si preces veritate nitantur*: that is to say, *if the petition be grounded vpon truth*, and no man of reason or learning euer taught the contrary, howsoeuer any lawe made by prince should stand in force, although hee were induced thereunto by false motiues, and therefore is this comparison safely made here, and most ignorantly. And no lesse false it is, which is here affirmed, that there was a *diuision begun betweene Catholicke priests, and Religious men, as well for the matter of the pretended association, as also about the slanderous Memorall sent ouer by Robert Fisher*: for so soone as the priests perceiued that some did dislike of the association, they gaue over the soliciting it here in England, and this matter of the



*Memoriall* came too late from England to Rome (as is shewed in the reply to the 8. Chapter of the *Apologie*) to be a case of this subordination, but somewhat must be said to patch vp a broken matter, and rather then faile, the religious men shall now be brought in, who were cleane out of the Card. *Casertanes* letter, as now we haue it.

In the same 20. leafe, this author sayth, that he will end with one tricke more of theirs, wherewith they end this booke: that is, that *Fa. Garnet* hauing written to them a letter, exhorting to peace, and telling them, that he doubted not but they sought the glory of God, and consequently would hearken to the meanes &c. they now will needs take him at his word, & threape vpon him, that he knoweth they seeke nothing but the glory of God in all these their actions and scandalous attempts: *Fa. Garnet* (say they) knoweth wee doe seeke the glory of God, and witnesseth so much in his letter dated on Midsummer day last past. Loe here how substantially they prooue by *F. Garnets* testimony, that they doe seeke the glory of God: euery child will laugh at this, and so we need to say no more of it.

First it is false, that *Fa. Garnet* is said to haue written vnto them: for his letters were to certaine other prisoners, to deale as it were betweene both parts. Secondly hee proposed such meanes, as hee himselfe best liked, but were not indeede any meanes for peace. Thirdly, howsoeuer this fellow cauilleth, or commenteth vpon the hope of peace, there is nothing there cited, but what *F. Garnets* letter will beare: *I know also* (sayth *F. Garnet*) that those which complaine against vs doe desire Gods glorie: but it is to be vnderstood, according to the meaning of the Iesuits (as it seemeth) who alwayes doe meane what they list, and euery childe may very well laugh at it, and hee who taketh hold of any thing which proceedeth from them, is as sure as he is of the wet Eele which he hath by the taile: yet true it is, that thus the Iesuite writ, but what meaning hee had, he shall expound himselfe, for so hee will whatsoeuer his words are: and so we need to say no more.

The *Appendix* maker hauing scurried a little ouer the hope of peace, of which he would gladly haue bin discharged much sooner, runneth ouer the booke which is dedicated to the *Inquisition*, in which his labours there occurreth no new thing worth  
the



the noting. In this he spendeth almost foure leaues, & the most part thereof is in gentle perswasions, yet can hee not ouerpasse Ma. Charnocks going into England contrary to the sentence, wherein he was charged vnder mortall sinne, not to goe (as he interpreteth the sentence:) he telleth moreouer, how that Cardinall Burghese writ a letter vnto M. Charnocke while he was yet in France, dissuading and condemning that fact, if he should doe it, &c. which the letter it selfe, and the Apologie also, fol. 156. conuinceth of an egregious falshood. Afterward hee telleth his Reader, that M. Charnocks reply was *so irreuerent and malapert, as any modest man that shall read it, can but feele his eares burne in behalfe of so honorable and venerable a man, as the good Cardinal is:* but there is not one of M. Charnocks reasons answered, which doe iustifie his returne into England, notwithstanding that sentence, which was giuen in the letter of the two Cardinals, Caietane and Burghesius: neither is it the fashion for this fellow to answer the reasons otherwise then as olde heretickes were wont, who when they had not what they could say against the Catholikes, they would breake into railing: and in the 24. this fellowe not knowing, in what particular to take exceptions against the narration of the vsage of M. Do. Bishop, and M. Charnocke at Rome, he telleth his reader, that *they set it forth so tragically, as any acte euer done by Nero, Caligula, or Dioclesian.* A good commendation for those, who were the cause thereof, nothing being there set forth, but what was most true. Lastly, there is a little somewhat in the defence of F. Parsons, of whom this authour cannot deserue too much: but his actions haue ben too grosse in the managing of this matter to be now concealed, or smothered vp. God send him his grace, that he may see his owne naughtinesse in time, and saue his soule after so many desperate aduentures, which also I heartily wish to them all, who haue either maliciously or ignorantly run this wicked course against Catholike priests.





**The Contents of the Chapters, with  
the page wherein euery Chapter  
beginneth.**

- Chap. i. **H**ow the Author of the Apologie playeth at All hid with his Reader, and while he is couered vnder the name of vnited Priests, he discouereth himselfe to be a Iesuite. pag. 5.
- 2 **A** Table of some notorious falshoods and apparant shiftings which are contained in the Apologie. pag. 8.
- 3 **A**n answer to those calumniationes which the Apologie-maker setteth out in a booke intituled, Of certaine principall deceits, falshoods, and flanders. pag. 18.
- 4 **H**ow the Author of this Apologie followeth that counsel which Achitophel gaue to Absalom 2. Reg. 16. that other seeing how he abused his Holinesse, might the more desperately adhere vnto him. pag. 39.
- 5 **H**ow the Apologie-maker by the same reason which he giueth for the publishing of his Apologie, doth giue light to his Reader to conceiue the iust cause which the priests had to print their books. pag. 55
- 6 **H**ow this present controuersie about the abuse of this new Subordination, is deduced from Iohn of Gaunt, and other matters most impertinent thereunto. Apol. cap. 1. pag. 63.
- 7 **H**ow this Author of the Apologie while he would inueigh against dangerous and temerarious propositions, engageth himselfe further then becommeth a Catholike. Apol. cap. 2. pag. 105.
- 8 **H**ow this Author layeth his plot for the disgrace of Secular priests, and draweth on his Reader with diuers idle stories. Apol. cap. 3. pag. 142.
- 9 **H**ow this Author pursueth his impertinent discourses of troubles among the English in Flanders, France, Italy, and Spaine. Apol. cap. 4. pag. 147.
- 10 **H**ow the stirres in the English Colledge at Rome beganne, the cause whereof this Apologie-maker doth seeke to colour and to lay it, where it should seeme it was not. Apol. cap. 5. pag. 151.
- How



<i>How this Author bestirreth himselfe to lay the faults of the scandalous division in Wisbich, upon those Priests, who would not subiect themselves to that insolent Agencie of the Iesuits. Apolog.cap.6.</i>	Chap.11. pag. 153.
<i>How this present controuersie is dissembled, and fetched from a head in Flanders, by the Apologie-maker. Apol.cap.7.</i>	pag.158. 12
<i>How the Authour of the Apologie to cloake the Iesuits their dealings concerning the institution of the new Subordination, perswadeth his Reader that his holinesse was moued thereto by certaine letters which were long after written. Apol.cap.8.</i>	pag.171. 13
<i>How this Apologie-maker perswadeth his Reader that his Holinesse was moued to imprison the two priests who went first to Rome by certaine letters which were written long after his resolution to imprison them, and how he iuggleth about that which chanced vn- to them in Rome. Apo.cap.9.</i>	pag.228. 14
<i>How this Apologie-maker shuffeth off the true cause of this present controuersie, and layeth the blame therof upon the Secular priests. Apol.cap.10.</i>	pag.264. 15
<i>How the two bookes against which the Apologie is written, are slight- ly run ouer with a few cauils against them. Apol.c.11.</i>	pa.300. 16
<i>How this Author busieth himselfe to purge F. Parsons of his expul- sion out of Baliol Colledge at Oxenford, and other matters where- with he is charged. Apol.cap.12.</i>	pag.322. 17
<i>How the Secular Priests appealing to Rome and going to his Holinesse for iustice against the vniust slanders of the Iesuits and their adhe- rents, are falsly and with great ignominie to the Sea Apostolicke, compared by this Apologie-maker to Alcymus and to Simon, who went to Demetrius and Apollonius, heathen persecuters of Gods people and his Priests. Apol.cap.13.</i>	pag. 331. 18
<i>A Reply to the Appendix of the Apologie.</i>	pag. 341.

FINIS.







